

**The Role of Motivation and Engagement
in a Fourth-Grade English Language Arts Title 1 Classroom**

by

Sarah Ann Palazzi

Bachelor of Science in Elementary Education, Shippensburg University, 2009

Master of Science in Elementary Education, Saint Francis University, 2013

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
School of Education in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Education

University of Pittsburgh

2020

UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

This dissertation was presented

by

Sarah Ann Palazzi

It was defended on

June 19, 2020

and approved by

Byeong-Young Cho, Assistant Professor, Department of Instruction and Learning

Maria Genest, EdD, Assistant Professor, Education, LaRoche College

Dissertation Advisor: Patricia A. Crawford, Associate Professor, Department of Instruction and
Learning

Copyright © by Sarah Ann Palazzi

2020

The Role of Motivation and Engagement in A Fourth-Grade English Language Arts Title 1 Classroom

Sarah Ann Palazzi, EdD

University of Pittsburgh, 2020

The purpose of this study was to investigate how supplemental materials and instructional practices such as Turn and Talk affected student comprehension and efficacy in a fourth-grade classroom with 22 Title 1 students. I paired explicit reading skill and strategy instruction with motivation and engagement constructs and innovative instructional practices to help improve comprehension. On a 1-3 scale, with 1 being “not very fun” and 3 being “desire to do more of that” activity, students rated the instructional practices from 1.8 (graphic organizers) to 2.8 (choose your own). The results of the comprehension measures were inconsistent; students showed improvement on one measure but not on another. Conclusions also cannot be drawn about impact of instruction on comprehension because there was not a control group and students had been exposed to the innovative practices since third grade.

Through detailed reflections, recorded class sessions, interviews with select students, comprehension measures, and student feedback, I investigated elements of instruction that contributed to building a culture of self-efficacy. Findings indicated that students who read a lot and had help from home saw themselves as good readers and that students who had low scores on a computer-based reading monitoring program (Accelerated Reader/AR) did not see themselves as good readers. From lesson plan notes, video recording of lessons and reflection, I learned that students were more engaged in activities that had an engagement or motivation

construct and/or an innovative instructional lesson. Participation was as high as 95% during one innovative instructional practice. Students were also more comfortable taking risks in small groups and grew their confidence for independent work after small group activities. Implications for educators include continued professional learning in the area of motivation and engagement constructs, a close look at the benefits and drawbacks of AR Reader, and implementation of innovative instructional practices.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	x
1.0 Introduction.....	1
1.1 Context and Participants	1
1.2 Significance	5
1.3 Scope of Inquiry.....	7
1.4 Questions for Literature Review	8
2.0 Review of Literature	9
2.1 Introduction	9
2.2 Motivation	9
2.3 Engagement.....	13
2.4 Self-Efficacy	15
2.5 Expectancy-Value Theory.....	17
2.6 Effective Practices	18
2.6.1 Learning and Knowledge Goals.....	19
2.6.2 Real-World Interaction	19
2.6.3 Interesting Texts.....	20
2.6.4 Autonomy Support.....	20
2.6.5 Strategy Instruction	21
2.6.6 Collaboration Support	21
2.6.7 Evaluation	22
2.7 Struggling Learners and Cognitive Factors.....	23

2.8 Conclusion	24
3.0 Methods.....	25
3.1 Inquiry Questions	25
3.2 Inquiry Design	25
3.3 Evidence and Methods	26
3.4 Data Collection Procedures	31
3.5 Data Analysis Procedures	32
4.0 Findings.....	36
4.1 Overview.....	36
4.2 Research Question 1	38
4.2.1 Video Data	38
4.2.2 Interview Questions	40
4.3 Research Question 2	46
4.3.1 Informal Reading Inventory Measure	46
4.3.2 STAR Assessment	47
4.3.3 Student Rankings of Innovative Instructional Practices	48
4.3.4 Summary	50
4.4 Research Question 3	51
5.0 Discussion.....	53
5.1 Limitations	55
5.2 Future Research and Implications.....	56
5.3 Conclusion	59
Appendix A Lesson Plans.....	61

Appendix B Tracking Sheet Example	100
Appendix C Reflections	102
References	109

List of Tables

Table 1 Innovative Instructional Practices..... 3

Table 2 Evidence, Method, and Analysis 27

Table 3 Dissertation Timeline 34

Table 4 Average Ratings Across Interventions 49

Acknowledgements

“Hey look Ma, I made it”

Panic! At the Disco

First and foremost, I need to thank my husband, AJ, for his unwavering love and support. On my hardest days during this Ed.D journey, he was right beside me, cheering me on. Whenever I thought I couldn't do this work, he pushed me to believe in myself.

To my dog, Rocky, who passed during this journey, and to my dogs Lola and Otis: thank you for being my companions and for always offering a snuggle and a kiss to get me through.

To my parents, Brady and Jodi Leahey, thank you. Your love and nurturing have gotten me to where I am today. Thank you for helping me realize my potential and for giving me the willpower to continue, even when it was hard. I love you both.

To my mentor, Francine Endler, I truly could not have done this without you. From your help with my application to Pitt, to morning coffee chats, to wellness calls—I truly appreciate the time and energy you invested into my doctoral journey. You were right—it was the hardest thing I've ever done, but so worth it.

To my committee chair and advisor, Dr. Patricia Crawford, I thank you for your kindness. I know I emailed a lot and had mini-meltdowns regularly, but you never wavered in genuinely caring about me and my work. Your kindness means more than you know.

Dr. Cho and Dr. Genest, I thank you for all of your time and effort you spent on the last leg of this journey with me. Your feedback and suggestions have been invaluable.

1.0 Introduction

The focus of this study was to examine the impact of supplemental materials and innovative practices (such as Turn and Talk) on students' comprehension and efficacy. The significance of these relationships are important at both the national and local levels. It is crucial to support students' reading comprehension in the intermediate grades because this skill is imperative for lifelong success. My particular interest in this area stems from my 10 years of experience in elementary education.

Over the past 10 years, I have worked with learners who have struggled with comprehension and who appeared to need support with motivation and engagement in literacy learning. I have encountered a number of students who could access text, but could not comprehend what they read. This type of "word-calling" and "word-reading," which is devoid of meaning, does not allow students to move beyond decodable texts as they progress through their K-12+ education. Because comprehension is one of the most important pillars of reading, there is a need for extended work in this area across K-12+ school settings.

1.1 Context and Participants

The study took place in a fourth-grade, English-Language Arts classroom at Valley Elementary School¹. There were 20 European American students, one African American student and one Asian student who received English Language support from the district's English

¹ Pseudonym

Language teacher. The students were mostly from low-income households. All students lived within the school's boundaries. All students were one to three grade levels below the fourth-grade reading level

Of the 22 students in the classroom, one student qualified for special education and had two Individualized Education Plan's (IEPs), one for math and one for reading. To qualify for Title 1 as fourth graders in the district, students needed to score Below Basic or Basic on their third- grade Pennsylvania System of School Assessment (PSSA; Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, 2020); have a score of 13 or less (out of 20) on their beginning of the year TORCH assessment (Northern Territory Government, 2016); be in the 40th percentile or below on their STAR Reading assessment (Renaissance Learning, 2016); and/or have a teacher recommendation. At Valley Elementary, all teachers recommended students for Title 1 services because it was a full-school Title 1 school.

I conducted this research within the context of the fourth-grade classroom. The classroom teacher, Mrs. Johnson², led the majority of the reading lessons, and I focused on each story's target skill and target strategy. Lessons were approximately 35 to 45 minutes long, five times per six-day cycle, for eight weeks. When I was not in the room, Mrs. Johnson continued with instruction.

The text I used for my research was Unit 2 in the *Journeys* reading program curriculum, a basal series developed by Houghton Mifflin Harcourt (Jago et al., 2017). Because of the pre-selected text format, I predicted that interest levels might wane for students who were uninterested in the story content. To remedy this, I used other materials, including articles, videos, fictional stories, and what I termed *innovative instructional practices* (which consisted of

² Pseudonym

Jigsaw, Tickets out the Door, Whip Around, Hand Up-Pair Up-Share Up, Graffiti Wall, and Gallery Walks; see Table 1 for detailed descriptions of each innovative instructional practice). I studied these practices while earning my instructional coaching certification. In addition to these basal lessons, students participated in an Accelerated Reader (AR), which involved reading books, taking tests, and getting points.

Table 1 Innovative Instructional Practices

Instructional Practice	Description
Jigsaw	According to Marzano and Pickering (2010), “In this structure, students are part of a home group, and each member of this group is responsible for learning a specific piece of the content and then teaching it to the rest of the group. During a typical class period, students work in three phases: (1) an independent phase, during which they learn about their piece; (2) a collaborative phase, during which they work with an ‘expert group’ consisting of members of other home groups who are learning the same piece of information; and (3) a final phase, during which they gather with their home group to take turns teaching each piece of content” (p. 22).
Ticket Out the Door	Using Ticket Out the Door, or exit tickets, at the end of a lesson or when students are physically leaving a space is a quick and effective formative assessment for teachers. According to Marzano (2012), there are four types of exit ticket prompts: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Prompts that provide formative assessment data: To find students’ current level of understanding 2. Prompts that stimulate student self-analysis: To determine how students assess their attention and learning for the lesson 3. Prompts that focus on instructional strategies: To assess how students received the strategies 4. Prompts that are open communications to the teacher: To allow students to offer feedback on the way the teacher taught the class (Marzano, 2012).

Table 1 (continued)

Whip Around	Whip Around actively engages students and encourages participation. Students write down responses to a question or prompt given to them by the teacher and quickly share their responses with the class. Students have to pay attention and listen closely to their classmates' responses to compare them to their own (Shirtekar, n.d.).
Hand Up-Pair Up-Share Up	In Hand Up-Pair Up-Share Up, teachers pose a question to students. After students have time to respond, the teacher has them put up their hands and find a partner who also has a hand raised. They then each share their answer. Then, hands go back up and they find a new partner to share their answers with (Dillard, 2016).
Graffiti Wall	Graffiti Walls are a great tool for teachers who need to engage students in their learning. Teachers begin by placing large sheets of paper on walls in the classroom. The teacher may pose a question and have students write on the paper what they know. At the end of the lesson, students can revisit their initial thoughts and add or modify their original thoughts. Teachers can pose questions on the paper at the end of a lesson/unit/chapter, once learning is completed, and have students respond. This helps shyer students as answers are anonymous. Teachers can also assign Graffiti Walls as a project for students. They are a great way for students to show with words and pictures their understanding of a topic (Short, n.d.).
Gallery Walk	Gallery Walk is a discussion technique that allows students to be actively engaged as they walk throughout the classroom. Students work together in small groups to share ideas and respond to meaningful questions, documents, images, problem-solving situations and/or texts (Harton, n.d.).
Turn and Talk	Turn and Talk is an oral language support strategy that provides students with scaffolded interactions so they can formulate ideas and share their thinking with another student. Turn and Talk supports Vygotsky's theory of social learning and the importance of speaking with peers to support language development (West & Cameron, n.d.; see also Vygotsky, 1980).

I used the anchor texts to teach the main skill and strategy for each story, and then implemented engagement and motivation constructs using innovative instructional practices. From January through March, I used the following stories from the text to teach important reading skills and strategies: Lesson 6: Invasion from Mars; Lesson 7: Coming Distractions; Lesson 8: Me and Uncle Romie; and Lesson 9: Dear Mr. Winston. (Journey 2017 cite here).

In terms of positionality, I am a European American, middle income, female educator who resides within the district, where I function as a Title 1 Reading Specialist. I hold my Level II certification in the state of Pennsylvania. I hold a Master's Degree, a Reading Specialist certification, and an Instructional Coach certification. This is my third year as a Reading Specialist. I transitioned to this position after spending seven years as a fifth-grade classroom teacher.

1.2 Significance

Reading to understand is the main purpose for reading. In my school district at the time of this study, teachers, principals, and administrators consistently expressed concerns about students' comprehension and their motivation for reading. Overall, students in the district were not performing well on the PSSA. This was especially true on the English-Language Arts portion of the test, particularly in the areas of text-dependent analysis (questions the student can answer only by referring back to the text). Despite varied efforts within the school system, fourth-grade scores were not improving for students who scored in the bottom one-fifth on their PSSA. They were also not improving for fourth graders who scored proficient or advanced. That percentage

dropped from 89 in 2012 to 70.4 in 2019 (Pennsylvania Department of Education, 2019). Based on the data, something was amiss in fourth grade at Valley Elementary School.

These types of comprehension concerns were not just specific to my district; they are a nationwide problem. These types of comprehension concerns were not just specific to my district; they are a nationwide problem. The Nation's Report Card (National Assessment of Educational Progress, 2019) found that, "In 2019, thirty-five percent of fourth-grade students performed at or above the proficient level on the reading assessment." These data points suggest that nationwide, students are struggling with comprehending proficiently on grade level, and if educators do not address the problem by fourth grade, these students may never reach grade-level proficiency. As the 2010 report from The Annie E. Casey Foundation (The Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2010), explained, "Reading proficiently by the end of third grade (as measured by NAEP [National Assessment of Educational Progress] at the beginning of fourth grade) can be a make-or-break benchmark in a child's educational development. Up until the end of third grade, most children are *learning to read*. Beginning in fourth grade, however, they are *reading to learn*, using their skills to gain more information in subjects such as math and science, to solve problems, to think critically about what they are learning, and to act upon and share that knowledge in the world around them" (p. 8).

Research shows that most students still love school during their elementary years; however, if they have teachers who primarily value performance-driven work (such as grades, comparisons between students, and test scores), struggling readers are more likely to be less engaged with literacy and lose the motivation to read (Guthrie and Davis, 2003). Because I work with struggling fourth-grade students, I focused in this study on engagement strategies and motivational practices that I hope will foster a love of learning in my students and improve

comprehension. Focusing on comprehension is important because an understanding of what they read is of utmost importance for students. Learned (2016) found that achievement in literacy in middle school and high school has a direct impact not only on success in school, but also on success once students graduate. Because of this, educators have the enormous responsibility of teaching children how to be critical thinkers. The status quo can be changed if educators focus on helping students become engaged learners.

Student engagement in learning is important because “students who are struggling lose their intrinsic motivation for reading more rapidly than students who believe they are competent readers” (Guthrie & Davis, 2003, p. 61, citing Harter et al.). When this happens, teachers must find new ways to reach students. Encouraging regular reading, using media, modeling comprehension orally, and paying attention to what youths read outside of school are all ways to re-engage students (Snow and Moje, 2010).

1.3 Scope of Inquiry

The purpose of the research was threefold. I wanted to know (a) which instructional elements contributed to building a culture of self-efficacy among the students in my classroom; (b) how specific instructional practices related to engagement and motivation affected comprehension; and (c) what I could learn about combining motivation and engagement constructs with explicit strategy instruction. To accomplish this, I conducted an action research study at Valley Elementary School. At the time of the study, 51.1% of the students at this school received free and reduced lunch. Because of those percentages, federal guidelines allowed the school to have a Title 1 teacher in the building. In that position, I co-taught with the classroom

teacher, with whom I had a solid working relationship. This allowed me to implement interventions within the classroom and gave me the freedom to use engagement strategies.

Study participants were Title 1 students from Valley Elementary. Fourth-grade students qualified for Title 1 if they met at least two of the following: (a) they scored less than 14/20 on their TORCH test, (b) they were in the 40th percentile on their STAR Reading assessment, or (c) their third-grade English-language Arts PSSA score was basic or below basic.

1.4 Questions for Literature Review

The following questions guided my review of scholarly and professional literature:

1. What instructional approaches contribute to building a culture of self-efficacy among students?
2. What perspectives explain the relationship between engagement and learning?
3. What causes disengagement in students?
4. How can teachers foster engagement and motivation, while also building comprehension?
5. Are the relationships, or lack thereof, teachers build with their students a contributing factor of engagement/motivation?
6. What instructional approaches have been designed and implemented to support engagement and motivation?

2.0 Review of Literature

2.1 Introduction

To better understand the relationship among instructional practices, comprehension and efficacy, I reviewed the literature on motivation, engagement, self-efficacy, expectancy–value theory, effective practices, and cognitive factors.

2.2 Motivation

Guthrie’s (2013) definition of reading motivation, which stated that reading motivation is made up of a reader’s goals, values, beliefs, and dispositions toward reading, drove my literature review and subsequent research. McGeown et al. (2016) stated that motivation could be broken into extrinsic and intrinsic motivation. Extrinsic motivation “refers to reading for external reasons, such as to gain recognition or a reward” (p. 110). Whereas intrinsically motivated students read:

Out of curiosity and to pursue their interests, expressing a preference for challenging texts that help them think and learn, and demonstrating a disposition to read independently for understanding, as well as for completing assignments and fulfilling teachers’ expectations. (Guthrie and Davis, 2003. p. 61)

In literacy, extrinsic motivation usually means that students complete reading and related reading tasks for reasons such as competition, recognition, and grades (Guthrie et al., 2007). It may follow then, that “children who are extrinsically motivated may perform tasks with resentment and disinterest, through coercion of an external goal or reward” (Logan et al., 2010,

p. 125). Because of this, external motivations can be a hindrance on a student's internal motivation, growth, and learning.

Becker et al. (2010) studied the relationships between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation amongst 740 third-grade students. The researchers found that third-grade reading literacy negatively predicted extrinsic reading motivation in grades four and six. The authors stated, "Children who read for extrinsic reasons have poorer reading skills than do children with lower extrinsic motivation" (p. 781). Further, if students are more focused on the prizes they get or the recognition for their grade, they will be less likely to become deeply involved with the task at hand and may not appreciate the work they put into it (Park, 2009).

Students can feel the pressures to read from varying sources. For example, Becker et al. (2010) found that younger children might feel pressured to read by their parents, whereas older children might feel this pressure from teachers and peers.

Marinak and Gambrell (2008) studied 75 third-grade students in a suburban school district, to explore intrinsic motivation as it relates to rewards for reading and to look at how varying rewards might influence reading motivation. The school had 18-25% free and reduced lunch and a diverse population; students were 40% European American, 30% African American, 20% Asian, and 10% Eastern European. All students scored between the 30th and 50th percentile on the Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition. The four groups for the study were (a) randomly selected book, (b) student selected token, (c) randomly selected token, and (d) no reward/no choice (control group).

There were three main findings in Marinak and Gambrell's (2008) study that have important implications for all classrooms. In the study, the students who received a book as a reward for reading and students who received no reward for reading were more motivated to

continue reading than their peers who received a reward unrelated to reading. This shows that students found the reward of a book for reading, or no reward at all for reading, to be positive for them. It also shows that rewards unrelated to reading might undermine students' intrinsic motivation to read. Finally, the researchers found that giving students a choice of reward did not seem important.

To understand the factors of reading motivation and the relationship between these factors and reading motivation, Park (2009) conducted a secondary analysis of data provided from the Progress in International Reading Literacy Study. The 2006 study involved 5,190 fourth-grade students from 253 classrooms from all fifty states and the District of Columbia. Park looked at two main data points: a reading assessment and background questionnaires given to students. Based on this analysis, Park found that a small amount of extrinsic motivation could bolster a medium level of intrinsic motivation, but could be unfavorable in those students with low levels of intrinsic motivation. Park (2009) stated that

Motivation is a very important component for better reading performance and [I] suggest that neglecting this component as in the case of the report by the National Reading Panel [Shriver, 2000] can be a serious flaw in the effort to improve children's reading abilities. (p. 356)

Bandura and Schunk (1981) completed an array of research on motivation. In their 1981 study, they focused on 40 students from middle-class backgrounds, between the ages of 7 and 10 from six elementary schools. They selected students who were identified as being deficient in math and had low interest in math activities. To ensure the students' math skills met the proposed criteria, two testers screened all participants. To test students' self-efficacy, the participants were randomly assigned to one of four groups: proximal (small, attainable) goals, distal (more difficult, less attainable) goals, no goals, or no treatment. Bandura and Schunk found

that students who set proximal goals were more likely to be intrinsically motivated to complete the task. This also helped build perseverance for new, challenging tasks.

The construct of intrinsic motivation is influenced by many factors. Guthrie et al. (2007) found when students are autonomous, or have the freedom to act independently and with autonomy, they are more highly motivated than their non-autonomous peers are. Further, students' curiosity, preference for a challenge, and involvement in school, all contribute to intrinsic motivation, as well as to comprehension (Guthrie et al., 2007; McGeown et al., 2016; Becker et al., 2010). Logan et al. (2010) found, "Children who had low reading skills but higher intrinsic reading motivation may have been more inclined to persevere with the difficult material due to interest, satisfaction, or a desire to develop their abilities" (p.127). Thus, intrinsic reading motivation can be a determining factor when struggling readers attempt to learn new and difficult concepts. Further, Becker et al. (2010) stated, "Sources of intrinsic reading motivation include positive experience of the activity of reading itself, books valued as a source of enjoyment, the personal importance of reading, and interest in the topic covered by the reading material" (p. 774). This positivity may carry over to new and difficult concepts. Researchers have found that intrinsic motivation is more beneficial in the long run than extrinsic motivation. This is because intrinsically motivated readers spend more time reading for fun and read more challenging texts than extrinsically motivated readers. Intrinsically motivated readers are often more likely to be deeply engaged in their reading and will employ any strategy needed in order to be successful in their reading (Park, 2009).

2.3 Engagement

Guthrie and Cox (2001) defined engaged readers as:

students who are intrinsically motivated to read for the knowledge and enjoyment it provides.... Engaged readers are also strategic... engaged readers are also wide and frequent readers... they read often and explore new territory through text. (p. 284)

Using this lens of engagement, Guthrie and Cox found there were four phases to teaching long-term reading engagement to students. These stages were observe and personalize, search and retrieve, comprehend and integrate, and communicate to others. During the first phase, observe and personalize, teachers help their students to observe a phenomenon and then use that to personalize their learning. For example, students could observe the moon and then use their observations to generate questions specific to their learning experiences and interests. The second phase, search and retrieve, is akin to research. Teachers would provide opportunities for students to search many different text mediums for their answers, including newscasts, books, magazines, and articles. The third phase, comprehend and integrate, focuses on direct instruction. Guthrie and Cox found that direct instruction on comprehending text and integrating information from multiple texts was important to engagement and motivation. Thus, during this phase, the teacher explicitly teaches skills that students need to succeed while reading new texts. During the fourth and final phase, communicate to others, teachers give students the opportunity to share what they have learned with their peers. By doing so, teachers legitimize the students' work. All of these phases are important to fostering engagement in classrooms (Guthrie and Cox, 2001).

Klauda and Guthrie (2014) completed a longitudinal study dealing with the development of "reading motivation, engagement, and achievement in early adolescence by comparing interrelations of these variables in struggling and advanced readers" (p.239). The participants in this study were 183 pairs of seventh graders. The researchers matched students according to

gender, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and school attended. Klauda and Guthrie used four questions to guide their research:

1. Are levels and changes in levels of motivation and engagement similar for struggling and advanced readers?
2. Are concurrent associations among motivation, engagement, and achievement variables similar for struggling readers and advanced readers?
3. To what extent do motivation variables predict growth in engagement and achievement for struggling and advanced readers?
4. To what extent do engagement and achievement variables predict changes in motivation for struggling readers and advanced readers?

Klauda and Guthrie (2014) then looked at engagement through the reading engagement model lens. This model is grounded in social cognitive theory and states that motivation is multidimensional, and has important tenets such as self-efficacy, value, intrinsic motivation, and peer value. The researchers also looked at the negative aspects of engagement, including devalue, or the belief that reading is not important; the perceived difficulty of unknown reading tasks; and peer devalue, or the perception of disrespect from peers when completing reading tasks.

The researchers found that, when teachers gave students the opportunity to experience relevance in their work, construct meaning, use scaffolds to handle complex texts, and foster interpersonal relationships, the students were more energized to work through text structures and explore the information in the texts deeply. Further, when teachers provided work related to “students’ choices, collaboration, importance and competence,” students were more likely to be motivated and engaged in their work (Klauda and Guthrie, 2014, p. 405). Thus, students are

more likely to be engaged and motivated when given autonomy or choice, competence support, and collaboration with peers. This is promising for classrooms because “combined with more reading of complex text and strategy instruction for that reading, increasing the multiple engagement supports for academic literacy may be beneficial for informational text comprehension” (p. 406).

2.4 Self-Efficacy

Bandura and Schunk (1981) defined self-efficacy as “judgments about how well one can organize and execute courses of action required to deal with prospective situations containing many ambiguous, unpredictable, and often stressful elements” (p. 587). Guthrie et al. (2007) expanded upon this definition by including attributes implicitly stated in the above definition: “belief in oneself as a good reader, confidence in reading, and knowledge and use of strategies in reading” (p. 295). These behaviors, positive or negative, directly relate to a students’ self-efficacy.

An individual’s self-efficacy is not static. Louick et al. (2016) found that levels of self-efficacy could change depending on the task the student is confronted with. This means that if a student has strong self-efficacy in one context, it may not be as strong in another. Louick et al.’s (2016) mixed-methods study involved motivation and reading comprehension. For the study, the researchers selected 112 struggling middle-school students from urban and semi-urban school districts. Because this was a mixed-methods design, the authors used several data collection pieces, including self-reported motivation surveys, a standardized reading comprehension test, and a random sample of 44 one-on-one interviews with students. Finding showed that students

who had greater self-efficacy at the beginning of the school year were more likely to have higher scores on the reading assessment.

Bandura and Schunk (1981) found that setting short-term goals could enhance self-efficacy in learners because students then begin to grow confidence in their ability to complete tasks, complete them well, and thus gain a basis for judging future performances. This gives students a level of satisfaction they can carry with them through new contexts. Further, to build self-efficacy, Bandura and Schunk argued that teachers should give students short tasks where they can achieve more in a shorter amount of time. When students do not need to labor over slow and arduous tasks, they judge themselves as more self-efficacious (Bandura and Schunk, 1981). Finally, Guthrie, et al. (2013) opined that realistic goals lead to increased self-efficacy.

Becker et al. (2010) believed that, in addition to using short-term goals and shorter tasks to build self-efficacy, teachers should also offer and support a wide variety of reading topics. By doing so, students could expand their background knowledge, become more comfortable with newer vocabulary, and build their reading automaticity. The researchers argued that, by improving in these areas, readers would build self-efficacy because they would not struggle as much with texts and could contribute to their learning by having a wider knowledge base of ideas. However, if a student viewed themselves as having poor reading skills, they would perform poorly on reading comprehension activities. Parsons et al. (2018) concurred, stating that:

Students' expectancy of success in reading determines their self-concept as a reader. If they expect to succeed in reading, they have a high self-concept; if they do not expect to succeed in reading, they have a low self-concept. (p. 509)

Thus, having a low self-concept can lead to poor self-efficacy because students do not have the confidence to attack hard and unfamiliar tasks. By implementing the aforementioned

skills and ideas, teachers can help students see themselves as competent readers who can accomplish difficult tasks.

2.5 Expectancy-Value Theory

Atkinson (1957) formed the original expectancy–value theory. He defined expectancies as “cognitive anticipations, usually aroused by cues in a situation, that performance of some act will be followed by a particular consequence.” (p. 360). He said, “The strength of an expectancy can be represented as the subjective probability of the consequence, given the act” (p. 360; see also Wigfield, 1994). Eccles and Wigfield (2002) expanded on Atkinson’s framework. They argued that expectancy–value theory fell under the umbrella of theories that focused on locus of control, wherein a person expects to succeed in a way that makes them feel in control of their successes and their failures. Under this definition, all choices have costs and all choices are influenced by both negative and positive characteristics (Eccles and Wigfield, 2002).

Eccles and Wigfield (2002) further argued that, “Expectancies refer to beliefs about how one will do on different tasks or activities, and values have to do with incentives or reasons for doing the activity” (p. 110). This definition encompassed many facets under expectancy–value theory. Two expectancy beliefs under this theory came from Bandura and his research from the late 1990s. According to Bandura, there were two types of expectancy beliefs: outcome expectations (beliefs as to how certain behaviors will lead to a specific outcome) and efficacy expectations (beliefs that one can perform the task that produces the desired outcome) (Eccles and Wigfield, 2002, discussing Bandura).

In 1983, Eccles and Wigfield established four key components of task value. The researchers deemed these components most important in personal expectations. The four components were, “attainment value, intrinsic value, utility value, and cost” (Eccles and Wigfield, 2002, p. 119, discussing 1983 research). The first component, attainment value, involves the relationship between the importance an individual places on the task, and how well they perform the task. This component deals with self-schema and how the tasks contribute to ideal selves. The second component, intrinsic value is “the enjoyment the individual gets from performing the activity or the subjective interest the individual has in the subject” (Eccles and Wigfield, 2002, p. 120). The third component, utility value, is a bit more complex, as individuals under this component are seemingly extrinsically motivated. With utility value, the individual completes the task, even if it is unenjoyable, in order to meet a short-term or long-term goal. The researchers defined the final component, cost, as a negative outcome of a task—for example, feelings of fear or anxiety that the individual has towards a task.

2.6 Effective Practices

In their study of effective practices in multiple classroom settings, Guthrie and Cox (2001) found that several important classroom features were necessary to foster long-term engagement in students. These features were (a) learning and knowledge goals, (b) real-world interaction, (c) interesting texts, (d) autonomy support, (e) strategy instruction, (f) collaboration support, and (g) evaluation. The researchers explained each feature and described ways to successfully implement the effective practices in classrooms, to create a sustainable reading engagement context.

2.6.1 Learning and Knowledge Goals

Guthrie and Cox (2001) defined learning and knowledge goals as “instructional goals that emphasize conceptual understanding in a specific topic within a knowledge domain. These knowledge goals are an organizing framework for an in-depth unit of teaching and learning” (p. 289). Organizing units and lessons around an essential question is motivating for students because it is focused on one content specific topic. This helps students organize their thinking and learning at their own pace. Learning and knowledge goals are also motivational because they allow autonomy to flourish in the classroom. Students are able to select sub topics and materials that cater to their learning and understanding of the specified concept.

2.6.2 Real-World Interaction

Guthrie and Cox (2001) stated that real-world interaction is “a provision of opportunity for students to have a sensory interaction (such as seeing, hearing, feeling, or smelling) with tangible objects or events as they could appear in their natural environment” (p. 290). This interaction motivates students because such activities are highly stimulating. Students are engaged because of the sensory activity, which prompts active learning. By showing students an authentic artifact, they tend to be “alert, attentive, and excited” (Guthrie and Cox, 2001, p. 291) during the activity. These behaviors are also intrinsically motivating for the learners. Further, when the curiosities can be “satisfied partially through reading activities, the motivation will be transferred to the reading behavior” (Guthrie and Davis, 2003, p. 70). This is important because the motivation to learn about the topic helps students sustain the energy it takes to engage with potentially challenging new texts.

2.6.3 Interesting Texts

Guthrie and Cox (2001) defined interesting texts as, “an ample supply of texts that are relevant to the learning and knowledge goals being studied” (p. 291). Such texts are very important to growing a culture of motivation and engagement in a classroom, as texts are central to reading instruction. When students are given new and exciting texts and can choose how they want to learn new information that relates back to the learning and knowledge goals the teacher set forth at the beginning of the unit, student interest will flourish.

2.6.4 Autonomy Support

Autonomy support refers to the teacher’s role in facilitating “student opportunity for choices and control of learning” (Guthrie and Cox, 2001, p. 292). Autonomy support is key to the other features of a motivational and engaged classroom: students can choose how they want to learn by selecting subtopics (knowledge goals); they may have observed something others did not (real-world interaction), and they are encouraged to select their own texts for learning (interesting texts). De Naeghel et al. (2012) found that when teachers focus on “affording choices, offering rationale, recognizing interests, and offering help and support” (p. 1018), autonomy increases and reading motivation can grow. In addition to teacher support, Guthrie et al. (2007) asserted that perceived control was at its highest when students “chose their own books, valued such choices highly, and had elaborate strategies for selecting books” (p. 306). Teachers can assist with this by listening to students’ interests and providing scaffolding so students can discover new learning on their own.

2.6.5 Strategy Instruction

Guthrie and Cox (2001) referred to strategy instruction as the “explicit teaching of strategic behaviors that enable students to acquire relevant knowledge from text” (p. 293). Explicitly teaching students strategies for comprehension through scaffolds and modeling impacts their comprehension. This is because students rely on those strategies when encountering new and challenging texts. Guthrie and Davis (2003) stated, “In the absence of explicit instruction, many middle school struggling readers cannot learn the comprehension strategies needed for their content learning” (p. 66). In addition, Cantrell et al. (2014) asserted that “adolescents need explicit instruction in cognitive strategies for comprehending text” (p. 36). All of these researchers’ emphasis on strategy instruction shows the importance of teaching students, regardless of age, explicit strategies in the area of comprehension, in order for those students to become more competent readers. By focusing on this, teachers can reinforce students’ independence as students employ strategies to navigate through new texts.

2.6.6 Collaboration Support

Guthrie and Cox (2001) defined collaboration support as a “teacher’s provision of structures for social interchange around learning the content (e.g., the learning and knowledge goals)” (p. 293). This support is motivational for students because it gives validity to students’ learning and efforts. Collaboration can also include working together to achieve a task or to learn something new. The collaborative groups of students work together on their own, learning goals that relate back to the learning goals the teacher set forth at the beginning of the unit. By

choosing what they want to learn about, who they want to work with, and selecting the materials for the task, autonomy grows.

2.6.7 Evaluation

The final classroom feature that Guthrie and Cox (2001) argued was necessary to foster long-term engagement in students was evaluation, which the researchers defined as “the use of teaching practices for judging student work that are compatible with the learning goals of the teacher and students” (p. 294). Thus, when teachers use evaluation for the wrong reasons, (such as checking to see that students are on task), it can erase all other features of a motivational and engaged classroom. This means that, if teachers want to evaluate their students’ knowledge of problem-solving skills, then the evaluation must be related to the skill. For example, a multiple-choice or true/false test will not adequately measure a students’ learning progression through a unit. Rather, when students are collaborating and researching something of interest, the evaluation should reflect the students’ work. When focusing on research as a skill, asking a student to show you their research or the way in which they researched a topic is a more beneficial form of evaluation than a standard paper and pencil test. Guthrie and Cox (2001) further believed that teachers should evaluate students on an individual basis and evaluate their work over time. For example, using portfolios gives teachers a more holistic view of a student’s learning over the course of a unit than a comprehension test would. And using multiple measures allows teachers to see where students are in relation to their learning of knowledge goals, and helps teachers plan and implement instruction.

2.7 Struggling Learners and Cognitive Factors

Cognitive strategies that students might employ while reading include questioning, schema, predicting, and inferring. When students can use these skills and strategies, they are more likely to comprehend what they read, because they are reading to satisfy a purpose or for understanding (Becker et al., 2010; Cantrell et al. 2014). According to Cantrell et al. (2014), “effective readers make strategic choices within the reading context and use procedural and conditional knowledge to determine how and when to apply comprehension strategies as they read” (p. 37). Struggling readers are more likely to have low self-efficacy, which leads to diminished drive to engage with challenging texts. However, with explicit teaching in comprehension and reading strategies, struggling readers’ motivation and strategy use can improve (Cantrell et al., 2014).

Struggling learners may also need more motivation from their teachers in order to complete a challenging task; the extra motivation can help students show greater achievement in their performance and growth over the course of a school year. Intrinsic reading motivation is something else that can aid in reading comprehension. Logan et al. (2011) found, “In the lower ability reading group, only decoding skill and intrinsic reading motivation contributed significant variance to reading comprehension performance” (p. 126). This further supports Cantrell, et al.’s (2014) research that strategy instruction can lead to higher comprehension in struggling readers. Further, “interventions aimed at increasing intrinsic reading motivation may be particularly important for low ability readers” (p. 127). Thus, fusing together strategy instruction and intrinsic reading motivation can have a significant impact on struggling readers’ comprehension. Finally, Park (2009) asserted that motivation can be an important part in reading performance for readers.

2.8 Conclusion

The research on motivation and engagement suggests that fusing the two will yield favorable outcomes for students. It is imperative, however, for teachers to understand the difference between motivation, which involves a reader's goals, values, beliefs, and dispositions toward reading, and engagement, where students read for the enjoyment of reading, use strategies to help them read, and read a wide variety of books (Guthrie and Cox, 2001). Teachers can motivate students with rewards related to reading, which gives students autonomy in choosing books, fosters curiosity, and shows students that reading can be a positive experience. However, engaging students in school is more involved than motivating students. Educators must scaffold, offer support, foster peer and teacher relationships, and offer work that is relevant to students' lives.

3.0 Methods

3.1 Inquiry Questions

In this study I sought to understand:

1. What instructional elements contributed to building a culture of self-efficacy among the students in my classroom?
2. Does explicit reading skill and strategy instruction coupled with motivational and engagement practices, and innovative instructional practices lead to increased comprehension?
3. What did the researcher learn about combining motivation and engagement constructs with explicit strategy instruction?

3.2 Inquiry Design

In this study, I addressed the impact of innovative instructional practices on comprehension and self-efficacy in a fourth-grade, low-proficiency English-Language Arts classroom. The iterative process of designing, implementing, reflecting, and changing informed my lesson plans. I used formal, informal, formative, and summative assessments to assess student engagement, motivation, and overall comprehension. I chose action research as my inquiry design because of its flexible nature. Action research is:

.. a participatory process concerned with developing practical knowing in the pursuit of worthwhile human purposes. It seeks to bring together action and reflection, theory and practice, in participation with others, in the pursuit of practical solutions to issues of pressing concern to people, and more generally the flourishing of individual persons and their communities. (Reason and Bradbury, 2008, p. 4)

Learning and adapting interventions was imperative throughout the course of this study. Because action research is active, reflecting and problem solving in nature, I had the autonomy to adapt my research as needed, and to replace strategies that were not as effective with more effective practices.

My instructional practice included pre and post-tests to check for student comprehension. I did this using two Informal Reading Inventory assessments. I administered one before the intervention in January, and one at the conclusion of the intervention in February. Both were summative assessments. I also used the STAR Reading assessment results from January and February to compare student percentile ranks against national standards. This test was also summative. I conducted formative assessments during class time, including graphic organizers, writing samples, and Tickets out the Door. My formal and informal assessments included lesson checks and student participation.

3.3 Evidence and Methods

Table 2 outlines my inquiry questions, evidence, and design and methods. The chart is broken into three sections that represent the three research questions I sought to answer.

Table 2 Evidence, Method, and Analysis

Research Question 1	Evidence	Design/Method	Analysis/Interpretation
What instructional elements contributed to building a culture of self-efficacy among the students in my classroom?	Interview quotes Video of volunteering	Implementation of motivation constructs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Autonomy – Curiosity – Strategy instruction – Choices and control – Hands-on activities – Interesting text – Collaboration to learn from text – Organizing graphically Engagement constructs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Relevance in work – Construct meaning – Scaffolds – Interpersonal relationships – Choice – Collaboration Innovative instructional practices – Jigsaw – Ticket Out the Door – Whip Around – Hand up-Pair up-Share up – Graffiti Wall – Gallery Walk – Turn and Talk 	Quantitative data analysis: Interview based on MRQ Organize the data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Sort the data by theme (predetermined by survey) – Decide which areas I am focusing on in my study – Create a spreadsheet to keep data and compare/contrast data – Create a table or graph that shows increases or decreases in all areas at the end of the intervention – Include quotes from students that support a culture of self-efficacy

Table 2 (continued)

Research Question 2	Evidence	Design/Method	Analysis/Interpretation
Does explicit reading skill and strategy instruction coupled with motivational and engagement practices, and innovative instructional practices lead to increased comprehension?	<p>IRI comprehension test</p> <p>ZPD (STAR Reading assessment)</p> <p>Percentile Ranking</p> <p>Lesson plans with strategies embedded</p> <p>Lesson plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Each week focuses on a different skill <p>Student work</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Example: graphic organizers or writings <p>On-task conversations</p> <p>Volunteering</p> <p>Pride in work; more effort put into work</p>	<p>Innovative instructional practices during reading instruction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Jigsaw – Tickets out the Door – Whip around – Hand Up-Pair Up- Share Up – Graffiti Wall – Gallery Walk <p>Artifacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Jigsaw – IRI – STAR Reading assessment results – Graffiti Walls – Ticket out the Door <p>Motivation constructs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Autonomy – Curiosity – Strategy instruction – Choices and control – Hands-on activities – Interesting text – Collaboration to learn from text – Organizing graphically 	<p>Quantitative data analysis:</p> <p>IRI comprehension test</p> <p>ZPD Levels</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Look at scores from BOY to MOY to determine if comprehension growth was achieved – Compare/contrast BOY to MOY scores <p>Percentile rank</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Look at scores to determine if growth occurred in percentile rankings – Compare/contrast BOY to MOY scores <p>Qualitative data analysis</p> <p>Lesson plans</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Repeated readings and adjustments of lesson plans to ensure thorough instruction is being given to each skill – Embed standards into lesson plans to ensure curriculum is being covered – Strategies will be written into lesson plans – Use lesson plans to track implementation of strategies

Table 2 (continued)

<p>Engagement constructs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Relevance in work – Construct meaning – Scaffolds – Interpersonal relationships – Choice – Collaboration <p>Pre and post interviews dealing with feelings about school work</p> <p>Explicit reading skills and reading strategies taught</p>	<p>– Reflection on lesson plans after the lesson has been taught to ensure effectiveness of skills and implementation of strategies</p> <p>Student work</p> <p>– Coding for growth in skills</p> <p>– Coding for growth in comprehension</p> <p>Examining to ensure efficient and correct use of strategies to aid in comprehension</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Story Structure – Fact and Opinion – Understanding Characters – Conclusions and Generalizations – Infer/Predict – Summarize – Visualize – Question 	

Table 2 (continued)

Research Question 3	Evidence	Design/Method	Analysis/Interpretation
What did the researcher learn about combining motivation and engagement constructs with explicit strategy instruction?	Field notes Recorded lessons Reflections after teaching the lesson	Watch recorded lessons Code for behaviors Volunteering Check for implementation of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Innovative instructional practices – Motivation constructs – Engagement constructs Reading skill/strategy teaching	Qualitative data analysis Compare video to lesson plans <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Am I teaching what I set out to teach? – Fidelity will be met by recording the video name and the time where the research-based teaching took place. This will ensure an easy check for anyone comparing notes to the video

3.4 Data Collection Procedures

My instructional practice included pre and post-tests in which I checked individual student comprehension. To do this, I used the Informal Reading Inventory (IRI) test (Roe & Burns, 2011). I administered one in January before the study began, and a second in February, when the study was completed. The first IRI test was called Form A; the second was Form B. Both tests assessed the same comprehension skills on a fourth grade-level, but with different stories. The skills assessed were main idea, detail, vocabulary, cause/effect, inference, and sequence. After students read the stories, there were ten short-answer questions. Students were able to return to the text to find answers to the questions. I also used the STAR Reading assessment results from January and February to compare student percentile ranks to a national standard. I kept all test scores in a spreadsheet on Valley Elementary School's secure database, on a safe, secure drive where all Title 1 teachers kept their raw assessment data.

My formative assessments took place during class time. These included graphic organizers, writing samples, and Tickets out the Door. I conducted proximal checks after each strategy to learn which strategies were most effective. These checks included small group interviews, Collins writings, and informal measures like thumbs up/ thumbs down and casual conversations. I kept notes of these proximal checks to ensure I understood which strategies were most effective with my class. My formal and informal assessments included lesson checks and student participation.

3.5 Data Analysis Procedures

For Research Question 1, “What instructional elements contributed to building a culture of self-efficacy among the students in my classroom?” I analyzed data from the student interview questionnaires and the live videos of my classroom lessons. For the interviews, I used the predetermined themes set forth by the Motivations for Reading Questionnaire (Wigfield & Guthrie, 1997), which is where the interview questions came from (see section 4.2.2 for the interview questions and answers). I primarily relied on video data, because it involved the entire class, whereas the interviews only involved nine students. I used a tracking sheet to record and analyze this data (see Appendix B).

For Research Question 2, “Does explicit strategy instruction coupled with motivational practices lead to increased comprehension?” I used both quantitative and qualitative measures to analyze change patterns. For my quantitative analysis, I compared each student’s IRI test results, pre and post implementation, and looked for changes in students’ reading comprehension. Next, I analyzed their Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) scores from the STAR Reading assessment from the beginning of January to the end of February, again looking for changes in comprehension. Finally, I compared the students’ January and February percentile ranks. Percentile Rank shows where students are in relation to other students of the same age who also use this program. Looking at three separate data sources for changes in comprehension allowed me to substantiate my statements and findings about student comprehension growth.

For qualitative data analysis, I reviewed my own lesson plans. I did this to ensure I diversified my engagement strategies, incorporated motivation constructs that built each student’s efficacy, and ultimately increased comprehension. After each lesson was completed, I journaled and reflected on the day’s lesson. By journaling, I ensured that I was thoughtfully

recording my feelings about the lesson, as well as keeping track of the students' perceptions of the lessons. I looked at student work and proximal assessments in order to drive my instruction and understand how the students' degree of engagement and motivation in their work is affecting their comprehension.

I also looked at the video recordings to chart and explore which students volunteered, thus providing me with information about student engagement. In addition to looking at the students' body language and behaviors on the videos, I also asked them to share with me their thoughts and feelings about the constructs and innovational instructional practices. Using Google Forms, they rated the constructs and innovative instructional practices on a 1–3 scale (1=Not very fun; 3=Let's do more!). Giving students a voice is important to me as a researcher. I wanted the students to know that their opinions mattered and that they would have a say in the constructs and practices.

Finally, for Research Question 3, "What did the researcher learn about combining motivation and engagement constructs with explicit strategy instruction?" I compared my lesson plans to the recordings of my lessons. I wanted to know if I was teaching the reading skill the way in which I planned and if I was using the innovative instructional practices correctly. By checking my lessons against what I actually taught, I explored how combining motivation constructs, engagement constructs, and innovative instructional practices with explicit instruction affected student learning. Using a double-check like this helped to ensure fidelity.

See Table 3 for my dissertation timeline.

Table 3 Dissertation Timeline

Timeframe	Task
June/July 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Became familiar with MRQ – Prepared copies of IRI test – Prepared spreadsheets for logging scores – Looked through the stories and begin to plan engagement interventions
August/September 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Did Title 1 Standard Assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Administered TORCH test ○ Administered STAR test – Contacted district and took necessary steps to be able to conduct action research in my classroom setting
October–November December 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Overview Meeting – Requested permission from parents for students to be a part of this study – Held an informational meeting night to review go over the scope and sequence of the study <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Nothing new to curriculum ○ Same daily schedule – Had permission forms there for parents Arranged a meeting with the IRB – Submitted research for IRB approval
December 2019–March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Implemented strategy instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Infer/Predict ○ Summarize ○ Visualize ○ Question ○ Analyze/Evaluate – Implemented skill instruction <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Story Structure ○ Fact and Opinion ○ Understanding Characters ○ Conclusions and Generalizations ○ Author’s Purpose – Implemented Innovative Instructional Practices <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jigsaw ○ Tickets out the Door

Table 3 (continued)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Whip Around ○ Hand Up, Pair Up, Share Up ○ Graffiti Wall ○ Gallery Walk ○ Turn and Talk – Implemented engagement constructs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Relevance in Work ○ Collaboration ○ Scaffolds ○ Interpersonal relationships ○ Construct meaning – Implemented motivation constructs <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Organizing Graphically ○ Strategy Instruction ○ Hands-on activity ○ Collaboration to learn from text ○ Choices and Control ○ Autonomy – Interesting texts
April–June 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Wrote dissertation <p>Defended dissertation</p>

4.0 Findings

4.1 Overview

The purpose of this study was to examine the relationship that motivating practices and engagement strategies had on students' reading comprehension and self-efficacy. Therefore, I implemented a number of innovative instructional practices, engagement constructs, and motivation constructs into the fourth grade English-Language Arts curriculum to explore potential connections.

I used four stories from Unit 2 in the Journeys (Jago, et. al) series as anchor texts for this study. The series uses Lexile levels to describe reading levels. Lexile measures are based on word frequency and sentence length taken from paragraphs at the beginning, middle, and end of a book or excerpt. A fourth-grade student should have a Lexile range between 740 and 875. The students' ranges in this class ranged from BR400L (BR=Beginning Reader; first-grade level) to 725L (end of third-grade level).

The first story, *Invasion from Mars*, was a play written by Howard Koch. This story follows a radio broadcast of a meteor hitting a farm in rural America. This play was adapted from H. G. Wells' *War of the Worlds*. No Lexile level was given for this story. Story structure was the target skill, Infer/predict was the target strategy. The second story, *Coming Distractions*, was an informational text written by Frank W. Baker. The purpose of this informational text was to teach students about movies and about how directors use different lighting, characters, and music to convey their messages. The Lexile level for this story was 740. Fact and opinion were the target skill, and summary was the target strategy. The third story in this unit, *Me and Uncle*

Romie, a realistic fiction story written by Claire Harfield. This story follows a young boy as he lives with his aunt and uncle for the summer in New York City. The Lexile level for this story was 780. Understanding characters was the target skill, and visualizing was the target strategy. The fourth and final story was Dear Mr. Winston, another realistic fiction text written by Ken Roberts. Written in letter format, Cara details to the librarian (Mr. Winston) why it is not her fault that a snake got loose in the library (even though it is very clearly her fault). The Lexile level for this story was 1110. The target skill was “conclusions and generalizations” and the target strategy was that of questioning.

I collected data collection over eight weeks; data included pre- and post-intervention comprehension tests, pre- and post-intervention STAR reading assessments, video recordings of lessons, daily teacher reflections, student opinions, student ratings of practices, and student interviews. I analyzed this mixed-methods data to answer the following research questions:

1. What instructional elements contributed to building a culture of self-efficacy among the students in my classroom?
2. Does explicit reading skill and strategy instruction coupled with motivational and engagement practices and innovative instructional practices lead to increased comprehension?
3. What did the researcher learn about combining motivation and engagement constructs with explicit strategy instruction?

4.2 Research Question 1

What instructional elements contributed to building a culture of self-efficacy among the students in my classroom?

To answer this question, I collected data from interviews and videos. The classroom teacher and I separately watched videos from each day's lesson. We reflected and compared notes once per week. We discussed what we saw and why we believed we saw certain behaviors from students. We had baseline perspectives about the students who volunteered in class at the onset of this intervention. We agreed that the students who volunteered tended to be the higher achievers in our classroom, as well as the students who seemed to feel the best about their academic abilities. We felt this way because they did their homework, they did well on assignments, and they rarely missed school. Our baseline perspective changed by the end of the intervention.

4.2.1 Video Data

I primarily relied on video data, because it involved the entire class, whereas the interviews only involved nine students. I had anticipated, at the outset of this study, completing twelve interviews, which would cover just about half the class. However, I only interviewed nine students because only nine permission slips were correctly filled out and returned. I used visual data and a tracking sheet to record and analyze the video data. I recorded the question asked, who volunteered, if the answer was correct or incorrect, any redirects, and answers stemming from the redirection. The data indicated the same group of students consistently volunteered time after time during whole group instruction. I worked off Guthrie et al.'s (2007)

definition of self-efficacy, which was, “A belief in oneself as a good reader, confidence in reading, and knowledge and use of strategies in reading” (p. 295). This seemed to indicate that only a few students felt they had enough confidence in reading to answer questions aloud in a whole group, and to feel the risk of being wrong was worth the reward. For example, six of twenty-two students consistently volunteered during whole group instruction throughout the intervention, meaning they volunteered multiple times per daily lesson and multiple times per story. These six students volunteered a total of 94 times during whole group instruction. Their answers yielded 13 incorrect responses and 21 correct responses. However, we did not call upon them every time they volunteered.

Large group instruction consisted of 22 fourth-grade students in this fourth-grade English-Language Arts Title 1 classroom. Of the 22 students, 9 were male and 13 were female. Within this group, two students had IEPs (one for reading and the other for math) and one student was an English-Language Learner. Reading levels of the overall group consisted of three students reading within a fourth-grade level (4.0–4.9), 13 reading within a third-grade level (3.0–3.9), five reading within a second-grade level (2.0–2.9), and one reading within a first-grade level (1.0–1.9). It is important to note that when this intervention took place, it was the students’ fourth- grade year, in the fifth and sixth month. In the school year, this is 4.5/4.6. When whole group instruction took place, it was to establish a basic understanding of the text. I asked students such as, “Who were the characters? What was the setting? What was the problem and solution?” We asked such questions because it is important to establish the basic parts of a text before asking students to analyze what is happening within it.

The same six students volunteered during traditional instruction throughout all four intervention stories as during whole group instruction. Participation was low; only one student

volunteered for questions during the first story, *Invasion From Mars*. The question, “What was Professor Pearson talking about?” and it came right from the text, immediately right after reading about the character’s actions. Another question, “Who remembers what we call the people who are in a play?” was a basic recall question from an earlier story, one posed by the *Journeys* series. Only two students volunteered for this one. During this time, students who were not volunteering were doing things like digging through their backpacks, playing with pencils, poking holes in their paper, and playing with their glasses.

Student interaction improved during each story when students were outside of the group setting and participating in a targeted innovative instructional practice. This happened throughout the intervention. Thus, showing students felt more confident sharing what they learned with a small group of peers than aloud in front of the entire class. Also, when I looked closely at the data during our innovative instructional practices, I found a slight uptick in volunteering. While doing Hand Up-Pair Up-Share Up, 95% of students shared their thoughts and ideas with three people, which was the assigned task. I found more of the same level of engagement when I coded for behaviors during our Jigsaws. Students in their small groups were talking, taking turns reading, redirecting each other to stay on task, and following along with their peers.

4.2.2 Interview Questions

The following two interview questions pertained to self-efficacy as it relates to reading and were designed to elicit findings for Research Question #1: “How do you think you will do in reading next year in fifth grade?” and “You’ve done a lot of reading this year in class and outside of class. Do you think you’re a good reader?” I asked these questions in order to gauge each student’s self-efficacy regarding their reading abilities. I was curious as to why students thought

they would or would not do well in fifth-grade reading. Was their level of self-efficacy due to activities we had done, or were there other factors that contributed to their self-efficacy? I designed these interview questions to illicit such answers.

Interview Question 1: “How do you think you will do in reading next year in fifth grade?” garnered seven optimistic answers and two slightly pessimistic answers. The two participants who believed they would not do well next year cited Accelerated Reader (AR) 3 as their main reason, as in this exchange with Interviewee 1:

Researcher: How do you think you will do in reading next year? In fifth grade?

Interviewee 1: Um kinda good, kinda bad.

Researcher: Why do you think you’re in the middle?

Interviewee 1: Uh, cause I think that I’m not going to get 100% on each quiz that I take. I’ll probably get an 80% or whatever.

Researcher: Why do you think an 80% and not a 100%?

Interviewee 1: Because I might get the answer wrong.

Researcher: But, why do you think you’re going to get them wrong?

Interviewee 1: Cause it’s a really tricky book.

This exchange with Interviewee 1 illustrated a weak sense of self-efficacy about how well she would do in a stressful future situation. Interviewee 1 felt that she would not do well in fifth grade because she wouldn’t get a 100% on their fourth-grade AR quizzes. She also stated that her level is down, which was a concern for her because her books wouldn’t be worth as many points as students who read books in higher ranges. She was one of the few students who consistently volunteered during whole group instruction so this was a surprising exchange. Interviewee 1 was also a leader at her table and in her groups, often being the first one to answer

³ Accelerated Reader tests are computerized tests on books that students read at their level. The tests ask questions about story structure and, as the books become harder, the questions include more abstract thinking.

questions correctly. This is an example of the baseline perspective the classroom teacher and I had that evolved throughout the course of this study. As a teacher, I believed the interviewee's self-efficacy regarding reading to be high; however, her answers indicated otherwise. This interaction shows that the student's self-efficacy seemed to be based on extrinsic measures; if she did not get a score she found acceptable, she might have a diminished attitude about herself as a reader. The other student who answered this question pessimistically also cited AR as her reason for believing she would not do well next year:

Researcher: So how do you think you will do in reading next year in fifth grade?

Interviewee 5: Not very well.

Researcher: Why do you think you won't do well?

Interviewee 5: Cause I'm not good at AR

Researcher: So because you are not good at AR, you think that you're just not a good reader?

Interviewee 5: [Shakes head "yes"]

Researcher: What about AR is tripping you up?

Interviewee 5: I read like three...let's say if I read *Green Eggs and Ham*, I read it three times. And then I take the quiz. I don't get it... right.

Again, this student was basing her entire reading self-efficacy on her AR quizzes. She based her beliefs in herself as a reader, and her beliefs as to how she would do in the future, on extrinsic variables.

The question, "How do you think you will do in reading next year in fifth grade?" yielded seven optimistic responses. Interviewee 4 had high self-efficacy regarding how she would do in fifth grade. This student based her opinion regarding self-efficacy on the fact that she read a lot and that her foster mom quizzed her. She had high confidence in herself as a reader because of the amount of reading she does and the validation she received from her foster mom.

Researcher: So how do you think you will do in reading next year in fifth grade?

Interviewee 4: Very good. 'Cause I'm good at reading.

Researcher: So what makes you think you're good at reading?

Interviewee 4: I read a lot of books at home, and then I have my foster mom quiz me on the words.

Interviewee 3 gave another optimistic response. He believed he was a good reader because he read a lot and his dad helped him whenever he missed a word. Because he believed it was his work tht contributed to his reading abilities, his self-efficacy was built around intrinsic reasons. This is evident in the following exchange:

Researcher: So how do you think you're going to do in reading next year?

Interviewee 3: Good.

Researcher: And why do you think you're going to do well in reading?

Interviewee 3: Because I'm already good at reading.

Researcher: What makes you say you're good at reading?

Interviewee 3: I might miss a couple of words here and there, but my dad helps me.

Researcher: Anything else?

Interviewee 3: Sometimes I work alone and read.

The responses to Interview Question One indicated that the students' self-efficacy was contingent on outside factors. With the exception of one student, the other eight interviewees built their self-efficacy on quiz grades and outside validation from a grown-up.

I asked Interview Question Two, "How do you think you will do in reading next year in fifth grade?" to gain insight into the students' self-efficacy, and garnered eight optimistic

answers with only one more pessimistic answer. Even though Interviewee 1 and Interviewee 5 answered Interview Question One unfavorably, they both answered Question Two optimistically.

Interviewee 1 believed she was a good reader, even though AR quizzes led her to believe she would not do well in fifth grade:

Researcher: So, you've done a lot of reading this year in class and outside of class. Do you think you are a good reader?

Interviewee 1: Yes

Researcher: What makes you say that?

Interviewee 1: Um, because I paid attention to the text and stuff.

This answer shows there is truth in Guthrie et al.'s (2006) definition of attributes of self-efficacy in reading: "A belief in oneself as a good reader, confidence in reading, and knowledge and use of strategies in reading. (p. 295)" This student believes she was a good reader because she used strategies in reading (paying attention to the text).

Another student's response supported Guthrie et al.'s (2006) assertion that students believe they are good readers when they can employ strategies to help them understand the text; this student's self-efficacy also came from validation This student needed validation in the form of a good grade, or for a teacher to let her know that she completed the graphic organizer correctly.

Researcher: Do you think you're a good reader?

Interviewee 9: Yes

Researcher: And what makes you think that you're a good reader?

Interviewee 9: Because when we are at school and we do graphic organizers or something, I do really good at them.

Part of Guthrie et al. (2007) definition of self-efficacy involved confidence in oneself She believed she was a good reader because she read a lot during her spare time:

Researcher: So tell me more about why you think you're a good reader. Can you give me some examples as to why you feel this way?

Interviewee 8: I read a lot. I read in my spare time.

By analyzing video and interview data, I found that students' self-efficacy was a complex matter. While some students believed they would not be good at reading if they did not pass AR quizzes, others believed that simply reading a lot made them a good reader. The example of the student who was one of a few who could always be counted on to volunteer (Interviewee 1), added another layer of complexity because the student believed she was not a good reader. Because strong self-efficacy combines how one believes they will do on an unknown task with how they did on a previous task, I would have expected this student's self-efficacy to be higher. When she volunteered in class, her answers were correct, according to my data collection; however, because the student did not do well on all of her AR tests, her self-efficacy was low.

The video data supports the idea that having students work in small group settings on tasks and at grade-level, yields a higher participation result than the traditional question and answer techniques we completed in whole group lessons using the Journeys series. Evidence of this is that a significant uptick in participation occurred once students were in small groups, mingling amongst each other, or working on a task that didn't involve answering in a whole group setting.

4.3 Research Question 2

Does explicit reading skill and strategy instruction coupled with motivational and engagement practices and innovative instructional practices lead to increased comprehension?

To answer this question, I compared quantitative scores pre- and post-intervention from the IRI comprehension test, percentile rank, Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), and Independent Reading Level (IRL) from the STAR reading assessment. I also analyzed student rankings of strategies and practices, which they did after they completed each story from the anthology.

4.3.1 Informal Reading Inventory Measure

Quantitative data indicated that 77% of students' comprehension increased on a written comprehension measure, 9% earned the same score, and 14% performed worse post – intervention compared to pre-intervention. The average score on the pre-intervention assessment was 4.7/10; the average score post-intervention was 6.2/10.

I used two passages to assess written comprehension on a fourth-grade level. Students read and answered questions independently. The pre-intervention passage was a fictional story about a boy who goes to a mobile library to exchange books. Students answered ten questions that supported major reading skills: main idea/detail, vocabulary, inference, and sequence. The post-intervention passage was a nonfiction passage about Sally Ride's trip to space on the

Challenger. This passage was also at a fourth-grade level and asked two questions, both dealing with the major reading skills.

4.3.2 STAR Assessment

The STAR Reading assessment yielded three data points to consider regarding comprehension: percentile rank, Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD), and Independent Reading Level (IRL). Percentile rank is an important component to understanding where students' comprehension lies in comparison to other fourth-grade students. A percentile rank of 40 is considered proficient according to Valley's Title 1 standards. The average percentile rank before the intervention was 28. Post-intervention, the average rank fell to 25.8. Breaking down the data further shows 4.5% stayed the same, 50% increased, and 45% decreased from the start of the intervention to the end of the intervention. Further, students whose ranks decreased did so by an average of 12.9 points; students whose ranks improved did so by 7.2 points.

The second measure from STAR were the ZPD ranges for students. Teachers use these ranges to measure a student's growth in comprehension, so students know which books to check out in the library. Pre-intervention, 4.5% of students had a range beginning in first grade, 63.6% had a range beginning in second grade, and 31.8% had a range beginning in third grade. These ranges are typical for a Title 1 ELA classroom in fourth grade. Post-intervention, 4.5% of students had a range beginning in first grade, 68% had a range beginning in second grade, and 27.2% had a range beginning in third grade. These ranges are consistent with the percentile rankings for each student, and give more information as to their ranking.

The third and final measure gleaned from STAR Reading assessment data are students' IRL scores. This data point takes into account students' percentile rankings, ZPD scores, and the

time it takes students to complete the measures and assigns a specific number for where the student can read on their own with no guidance from a more knowledgeable other. Pre-intervention, the average IRL was 3.19, which means the average reading level of my class was third grade, second month.

Post-intervention, the average IRL was 3.24. While these numbers are virtually the same, 59% of students' IRL increased during the eight-week intervention. Even though students' scores showed a conservative rise, there is no way to know for sure if their comprehension would or would not have improved without the use of innovative instructional practices because I did not have a control group. This control group would have read the same stories from Journeys and completed the prescribed activities for each story, but they would not have completed the innovative instructional practices.

4.3.3 Student Rankings of Innovative Instructional Practices

At the end of each story in the anthology, students filled out a Google Form where they rated each innovative instructional practice, engagement strategy, and motivation strategy on a scale of 1-3. 1 represented not very fun and 3 represented a desire to do more of that activity. I chose to use only 1-3 to keep it as simple and easy as possible for my students. Table 4 shows the averages for strategies and practices we completed two or more times over the course of the eight-week intervention (all ratings are out of 3).

Students' reactions to and rankings of the different innovative instructional practices are important for educators to consider when planning lessons, as choosing innovative instructional practices students that prefer will yield higher engagement in the activities.

Table 4 Average Ratings Across Interventions

Name of Strategy/Practice	Average Rating Across the Intervention
Choose Your Own	2.8
Hand Up-Pair Up-Share Up	2.3
Jigsaw	2.2
Whip Around	2.2
Gallery Walk	2.2
Leveled Readers	2.2
Graffiti Wall	2.1
Turn and Talk	2.0
Please Do Now	1.8
Graphic Organizers	1.8

At the end of the last story, I gave the students an opportunity to type feedback to me about the innovative instructional practices. They told me their top three choices, bottom three choices, explained a favorite, and explained a non-favorite. When given the prompt, “Tell me one of your favorites and explain why you liked it!” student responses included:

“I like the Choose your own group because we can choose our friends to be in your group.”

“gallery walk because I like seeing what people think about.”

“hand up-pair up-share up because you share stuff you came up with”

“Level readers I like level readers because it is so fun and I like reading them.”

“I love Graffiti wall because they explain your story opinion”

Not all students loved the same practices and strategies. When given the prompt: “Tell me one of your least favorites and explain why you didn't like it!” Students responded this way:

“Whip around because when i (I’m) sleepy i don't like to talk”

“Graphic organizers because it is too much writing!!!!!!”

"Whip around because I don't like talking”

“I don't like graphic organizers because thay [sic] are boring”

4.3.4 Summary

The results of the comprehension measures and student rankings suggest that teaching practices that focus on motivation and engagement may not have a correlation to increased comprehension. The comprehension data points to narrow gains made by students when analyzing all comprehension data points. The average score from the IRI rose by less than two points; percentile ranks dropped by 2.2 points; and independent reading levels only grew an average of half of a month. Within the parameters of this study, not every student enjoyed or benefited from a single teaching strategy, so it is important to note that one cannot pinpoint a single strategy or practice as the reason for growth or recession in comprehension measures.

4.4 Research Question 3

Research Question 3: “What did the researcher learn about combining motivation and engagement constructs with explicit strategy instruction?”

I used data from lesson plans, video recording of lessons, and reflections to help answer this question. I checked reliability when the classroom teacher and I compared notes on the video data we watched weekly. We met in her room before the school day began, and discussed what we saw—the individual student behaviors, and overall themes. The strategies explicitly taught during this intervention were Infer/Predict, Summarize, Visualize, and Question. The skills explicitly taught during this intervention were Story Structure, Fact and Opinion, Understanding Characters, and Conclusions and Generalizations. After watching videos of the lessons I taught, I found that students were more engaged in activities with an engagement or motivation construct, and/or an innovative instructional practice with the lesson. When I did a whole group question and answer during stories, I found that students were doodling, rummaging in their backpacks, had their heads on their desks, or were staring into the hallway or out the window. When I added activities like Jigsaw, collaboration, and hands-on activities, students would talk and share with their peers and took more pride in their work and helping others.

Data to support these claims come from video data and my own reflections of the lessons. Appendix C explains in detail the differences between teaching in the traditional question and answer format and using innovative instructional practices.

In sum, I learned that many factors affect engagement in lessons, and not every innovative instructional practices will work every time. A lot depends on the resources being used, as well as the personalities within each group. I believe that the more teachers use these innovative instructional practices in classrooms, the more comfortable students will become with

them and understand the expectations. By the last story, Dear Mr. Winston, Graffiti Walls were a success. Students completed the walls with no errors and listened to their classmates' answers.

5.0 Discussion

The purpose of this study was to address concerns about students' motivation, engagement, and self-efficacy in their learning—specifically as these related to them as readers during their fourth-grade year in my classroom. The students who participated in this study were fourth-grade Title 1 students at Valley Elementary School. All students were reading at one to three levels below a fourth-grade level when this study took place. I wanted to find avenues in which to engage learners in their reading. To do this, I embedded motivation and engagement constructs, as well as innovative instructional practices into the fourth-grade ELA curriculum used at Valley School District cross all elementary buildings.

Engaging students in their learning will result in increased achievement. As Klauda and Guthrie (2014) stated in their research, “motivation facilitates engagement, which in turn facilitates achievement” (p. 240). Engaging students is important because it will lead to achievement as readers and learners. Even though students only showed growth on the Informal Reading Inventory, these students had been doing these activities since third grade. Therefore, it could be possible that their comprehension had been improving since the beginning of their third-grade year. Comprehension growth is important because it will lead to better lifetime outcomes and better results on the PSSA.⁴ Discovering that my students rated activities like “Choose Your Own Group” and Jigsaw higher than Graphic Organizers was surprising at first. I always believed that Graphic Organizers were of high interest to my students because I also liked them. However, when I digested this information and reflected upon it, it really was not as

⁴ In 2020, due to COVID-19, there was no PSSA. This means there will be no standardized achievement and growth data on this cohort of students.

surprising as I originally thought. Of course, students showed an affinity for activities that promote socialization. As Vygotsky's (1980) sociocultural theory laid out, students need social interactions to build their learning. Also, children learn best when the social aspect is enriched and cultivated within their learning experience. Thus, students need interactions with adults and knowledgeable peers in order to learn and grow within the classroom. Guiterrez and Rogoff (2003) also asserted that learning can happen through socially constructed norms and practices. This further supports the idea that students learn language through social interactions. Students are "shaped by, values attitudes, feelings, and social relationships" (Perry, 2012, p. 54). Further, "literacy practices are more usefully understood as existing in the relationships between people" (Barton & Hamilton, 2000, p. 8). Building on the above statements, I deduced that when students can interact and learn from one another, they are more likely to engage in the task.

Unfortunately, students cannot always participate in group work. There are times where they need to complete tasks independently. Taking what I learned about students' preferences for group work, I can help teachers scaffold lessons that will support students as they make the transition from group work, to partner work, to independent work. Using the "I do- We do- You do" framework, teachers can spend time explicitly teaching skills and strategies using whole group instruction and mentor texts. The bulk of the time can be spent in the "We do" section; here, teachers can use the innovative instructional practices laid out in this study to support students' understanding and work as they grow and learn as readers. Once students feel comfortable completing related tasks in a small group setting, the teacher can begin to move towards independent work. By allowing the students to explore and take risks in their small groups, the students will find their independent work to be not as difficult because they have already spent time with the new skills and strategies.

5.1 Limitations

This study had three major limitations: materials, participants, and time frame. All of these limitations affected the outcome of this study. The first limitation, materials, is an ongoing battle in classrooms across the country. Some teachers are handed the task of finding their own texts that meet their state's standards, while other teachers are given a prescribed curriculum in the form of a textbook series. I had the opportunity to use the *Journeys* series as my core reading instruction with the freedom to add in additional resources. On the other hand, *Journeys* was constricting because I was unable to choose my own anchor texts in order to maximize engagement constructs, motivation constructs, and innovative instructional practices. As Becker et al. (2010) stated, "Sources of intrinsic reading motivation include positive experience of the activity of reading itself, books valued as a source of enjoyment, the personal importance of reading, and interest in the topic covered by the reading material" (p. 774). By using prescribed texts, I was unable to allow the students to choose stories they would find enjoyable.

The second limitation relates to this particular group of participants. These students have engaged in these innovation instructional practices for two school years. Because of this, there is no way to really know if the innovative instructional practices put in place were what led to marginal comprehension growth, or if it would have happened anyway. In addition, there was no control group continuing with the *Journeys* series as scripted. It would have been interesting to see if the self-efficacy between the intervention group and a control group was different due to the different approaches. Another limitation with this cohort of students is they are all one to three grade levels below a fourth-grade level, and the majority are European American, English-speaking students who come from middle to low income homes. This is a limitation because I do

not know what the results would have been with students who read on grade level, read above grade level, and/or from diverse backgrounds.

The third limitation, timeframe, is important because I felt limited in what I could accomplish in the time I had. Because each story had a target skill, a target strategy, comprehension questions, and vocabulary, I felt the pinch of only having 45 minutes per day with the students to get through the meat of the lessons. The classroom teacher took over all other aspects (English, vocabulary, and spelling), but 45 minutes is still not a lot of time to listen to a story, discuss it, and focus on the skills and strategies. Thus, having an extended timeframe each day may have allowed for more student engagement.

In addition to limited time per day, the study only spanned eight weeks. This is a limitation because it was difficult to fully immerse the students in the innovative instructional practices and the stories in this timeframe. This was especially true as in those eight weeks, we had interruptions like Valentine's Day, Presidents' Day, and grade-level activities. Because of this short time frame, the comprehension measures were too close together. I believe that, if the study took place over a whole semester rather than eight weeks (four stories), comprehension growth would have been better. This would have allowed the students more time to cycle through the innovative instructional practices, dig deeper into understanding and working with texts, and might have paid off in the form of better comprehension growth on my measures.

5.2 Future Research and Implications

Future research is needed on the true impact of innovative instructional practices on engagement, motivation, and comprehension—across grade levels and school systems, with

different materials, and with more time. Further, taking this study and implementing it in classrooms where traditional instruction is taking place would allow teachers and researchers to see if these practices lead to a more engaged class with higher self-efficacy.

Another area for future research is to focus on one innovative instructional practice per story, rather than multiple practices. In this study, I implemented many practices per story; my students had also done all of them previously, in third grade and earlier in their fourth grade year. By teasing out strategies, doing them one at a time, and comparing them to students' engagement and self-efficacy before implementation, teachers and researchers will be able to look systematically at each practice and be able to pinpoint which ones are most effective. Of course, each group of students is unique and will vary from one group of students to the next.

One implication of this research is the call for continued professional learning for teachers. Because I am an Instructional Coach in my building, and have completed research on engaging and motivating learners, I can facilitate professional learning for my staff. There is a need for this area because many teachers simply follow along with the basal manual, oftentimes trying to squeeze as much out of it as they can, in order to cover the curriculum. When this happens, extension activities, critical thinking, and other innovative work are the first things to go. Professional learning that highlights the significance of engaging learners can change the mindsets across the teachers in my building. In addition, in order for the teachers to feel they have the skills and knowledge to implement the innovative instructional practices, I can lead professional learning opportunities for my teachers. Should I have the opportunity to do this work, I would present my strategies, one at a time, along with the reasons and research that supports using them. I believe that when teachers are shown real life evidence that innovative

instructional practices work, they are more likely to take the time to hone the skills needed to successfully implement these into their plans and their classrooms.

Action research is especially significant for professional learning because it occurs on a small scale, with as many iterations as needed, in order to find success. In addition, this type of research is hands-on, which is beneficial because it allows teachers, and those who support them to affect change in real time. Action research is complex and involved with practical issues, thus it has the potential to be a perfect fit for getting teachers to buy in to learning about innovative instructional practices and the benefits of using them will be easier to do once they see action research is flexible. This type of research allows thoughtful practitioners to fail, reflect, and reimplement in order to find the desired outcome. In terms of my role with professional development, action research will allow me to spend more time with teachers and offer choices on what research they want to complete in their room, help them to attain materials they need, and coach them along the way in a non-evaluative respect to foster risk-taking in their classroom.

Another implication from this study relates to the use of Accelerated Reader (AR) in Valley School District. On Renaissance's website (AR's parent company), they state, "We help teachers teach better, students learn better, and school administrators lead better—all to improve academic outcomes" (Renaissance, 2020). However, According to What Works Clearinghouse Intervention Report, Accelerated Reader "was found to have mixed effects on comprehension" (What Works Clearinghouse, 2016, p. 1). Researchers further found that Accelerated Reader had negative effects on students' extrinsic motivations for reading. Willekes (2014) stated, "To educators and parents who are unaware of the long term, damaging effects of the program, it simply appears that students are reading more books in school and at home, motivated by the short-term goal of earning more AR points. When the rewards are gone, however, so is the

reading” (Willekes, 2014. p. 38). If students are left feeling poorly about their abilities as readers, and this program does not provide the promised comprehension growth, is it really worth the headache for our students? When students reported to me in their interviews that their AR scores directly affected their self-efficacy, it calls into question the worthiness of this program.

5.3 Conclusion

The implications of this study are important for educators to consider when planning and implementing lessons in their classrooms. Engaging children in their learning is crucial if we want students to remember and apply their learning effectively. As Keene (2018) states in *Engaging Children*, “We remember and reapply more effectively when we are engaged. And if students are more likely to learn effectively when engaged, we need to discuss how we can help them find those sweet spots” (p. 15). I believe that the research I conducted provides a starting place for educators to have conversations involving those sweet spots. When looking at the outcomes, data supports giving students multiple opportunities to engage in their learning through innovative instructional practices. Each innovative instructional practice explored in this research will not immediately translate to a different grade level, teacher, or cohort of students. It is important for educators to remember that innovative instructional practices need time to work; this means implementing them with fidelity and giving students a chance to work with them and feel comfortable.

The evidence presented in this study should give educators pause. Just because a student participates during whole group instruction, does not mean they are engaged. This behavior also does not lend itself to the student always being confident in their abilities to perform independent

activities. However, teachers can foster a love of learning by engaging their students in their work through the implementation of innovative instructional practices. By using these practices to build confidence in their students, students' self-efficacy and engagement in their learning will improve. Not every student will respond to every practice implemented, so it is important to offer a variety of choices when asking students to represent their learning. This autonomy will build a culture of learning and ongoing improvement within the walls of the teacher's classroom.

Appendix A Lesson Plans

Unit 2: Tell Me More			
Anchor Text	Target Skill	Target Strategy	Essential Question
Lesson 6: Invasion from Mars	Story Structure	Infer/Predict	How are performances similar to and different from written stories?
Lesson 7: Coming Distractions	Fact and Opinion	Summarize	How are movies a form of communication?
Lesson 8: Me and Uncle Romie	Understanding Characters	Visualize	How do an artist's experiences affect his or her art?
Lesson 9: Dear Mr. Winston	Conclusions and Generalizations	Question	What are some ways to do research?

Lesson Plan Overview <i>Journeys: Unit 2: Lesson 6: Invasion from Mars</i>				Teacher: Sarah Palazzi
				School: Valley Elementary School
				Subject: ELA
PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.2.4.C Explain events, procedures, ideas, or concepts in a text CC.1.2.4.E: Use text structure to interpret information CC.1.3.4.B Cite relevant details from text to support what the text says explicitly and make inferences. CC.1.3.4.C Describe in depth a character, setting, or even in a story or drama, drawing on specific details in the text. CC.1.3.4.K Read and comprehend literary fiction on grade level, reading independently and proficiently.				
Objective(s): The students will be able to correctly identify the three main parts of story structure (characters, setting, and plot) The students will be able to correctly identify the three main parts of the plot at the beginning of the story with 90% accuracy The students will be able to correctly identify the three main parts of story structure (characters, setting, and plot) The students will be able to correctly identify the correct plot for the story on their graphic organizer with 90% accuracy The students will be able to correctly identify story structure (plot, characters, and setting) within their groups The students will be able to read and comprehend a short passage on a third grade level with 95% accuracy The students will make inferences using videos and a graphic organizer with their partner with 80% accuracy The students will be able to correctly identify how to make inferences from text The students will correctly answer the comprehension questions from grade-level text about inferring; both aloud and in writing				
Engagement Constructs	Motivational Constructs	Skill/ Strategy	Innovative Instructional Practices	Materials
Relevance in Work	Organizing Graphically	Story Structure	Jigsaw	Please Do Now
Collaboration	Strategy Instruction	Infer/ Predict	Tickets out the Door	Paper Day 1
Scaffolds			Whip Around	Plot Plan Graphic Organizer (FCRR; C.006.ss4)
			Hand Up-Pair Up-Share Up	

Interpersonal relationships	Hands-on activity			Plot plan boxes for GO
Construct meaning	Collaboration to learn from text			Student Anthology
	Choices and Control			Teacher's Edition Unit 2
	Autonomy			Projectable 6.2
	Interesting texts			Small paper for Tickets out the Door
				PDN for Day 2
				Chromebooks
				Paper for writing learning
				Readworks passages (4) <i>The Great Escape</i> <i>The Hiking Trip</i> <i>Casey Saves the Play</i> <i>Caught in a Lie</i>
				Plot Plan: Projectable 6.2 for groups
				PDN Day 4
				Table work day 4
				Links for Google Classroom
				Inferences-Worksheet-3 Making Inferences About Awesome Animals

Day 1		
<p>PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.2.4.C Explain events, procedures, ideas, or concepts in a text CC.1.2.4.E: Use text structure to interpret information CC.1.3.4.C Describe in depth a character, setting, or even in a story or drama, drawing on specific details in the text. CC.1.3.4.K Read and comprehend literary fiction on grade level, reading independently and proficiently.</p>		
<p>Objective(s): The students will be able to correctly identify the three main parts of story structure (characters, setting, and plot) The students will be able to correctly identify the three main parts of the plot at the beginning of the story with 90% accuracy</p>		
Before	During	After
<p>Engagement Construct: <i>Relevance in Work</i></p> <p><i>Please Do Now: Collins Type 1</i> How are performances similar to and different from written stories?</p> <p><i>Please answer the question. You must write for 47 seconds!</i></p> <p><i>Put this in your ELA folder. All of the work we will be doing this week, will help us to answer this question at the end of the story!</i></p>	<p>Motivational Construct: <i>Organizing Graphically Strategy Instruction</i></p> <p>Listen to the story the whole way through, stopping to ask First Read questions from the Teacher Edition.</p> <p>At the end of the story, introduce story structure:</p> <p><i>Story structure involves characters, setting, and plot. Remember, plot is the action in the story. Let's look at pages 176-181 and complete the graphic organizer together for this part of the story. Later, you will do a plot plan for the whole story. What or whom are characters? Who or what are in the story. Very good. What is the setting? Where and when the story takes place. Perfect. Let's take a look at this graphic organizer together. Work together to complete the graphic organizer as a class.</i></p>	<p>Innovative Instructional Strategy: <i>Ticket out the Door</i></p> <p>What are the three main parts of story structure?</p>

Day 2		
<p>PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.2.4.C Explain events, procedures, ideas, or concepts in a text CC.1.2.4.E: Use text structure to interpret information CC.1.3.4.C Describe in depth a character, setting, or even in a story or drama, drawing on specific details in the text. CC.1.3.4.K Read and comprehend literary fiction on grade level, reading independently and proficiently.</p>		
<p>Objective(s): The students will be able to correctly identify the three main parts of story structure (characters, setting, and plot) The students will be able to correctly identify the correct plot for the story on their graphic organizer with 90% accuracy</p>		
Before	During	After
<p>Engagement Construct: <i>Collaboration</i></p> <p><i>Find a partner and answer the following question: How does the dialogue help you picture the setting of the play?</i> (The reporter gives details, such as hundreds of cars parked in a field and bright headlights shining on the crater)</p> <p>Innovative Instructional Strategy: <i>Whip Around</i></p> <p>Once students have had time to answer the question, do a whip around to hear what pairs have as their answer. Redirect and support as needed.</p>	<p>Motivational Construct: <i>Hands-on activity</i> <i>Organizing graphically</i> <i>Collaboration to learn from text</i></p> <p>Engagement Construct: <i>Scaffolds</i> <i>Interpersonal relationships</i> <i>Construct meaning</i></p> <p><i>Building on our learning from yesterday, we are going to do more with plot today. Each person needs a white paper, a pink paper, and their reading book. The white paper is your graphic organizer, and the pink paper has six major events from the story typed up for you.</i> <i>Working with the people</i></p>	<p>Motivational Construct: <i>Choices and Control</i> <i>Autonomy</i></p> <p>Post this on the Promethean Board:</p> <p>https://www.khanacademy.org/humanities/hass-storytelling/storytelling-pixar-in-a-box/ah-piab-story-structure/v/piab-storystructure</p> <p>https://www.khanacademy.org/humanities/hass-storytelling/storytelling-pixar-in-a-box/ah-piab-story-structure/v/video1a-fine</p> <p>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-_nePjWXecQ</p> <p>https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a0qq0h4xN34</p>

	<p><i>at your table, you need to cut out the boxes and glue them onto your graphic organizer in the correct order. Follow along reading the events as I read them aloud to you. (Read aloud all boxes to students.)</i></p> <p><i>Which event happened first in the story? Yes. "A cylinder has crash landed and people have come to see it."</i></p> <p><i>When you begin, that box will be glued onto the paper in box 1 on the white paper. Mrs. Singer and I will be around to help you as you work!</i></p>	<p>Using your Chromebook, log into Mrs. Singer's ELA Google Classroom.</p> <p>I posted a few links to videos about story structure. Choose one to watch.</p> <p>Write down one new thing you learned about story structure from the video.</p> <p>When you're done, make a pile on the kidney table with your answer.</p>
--	--	---

Day 3		
<p>PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.2.4.C Explain events, procedures, ideas, or concepts in a text CC.1.2.4.E: Use text structure to interpret information CC.1.3.4.C Describe in depth a character, setting, or even in a story or drama, drawing on specific details in the text. CC.1.3.4.K Read and comprehend literary fiction on grade level, reading independently and proficiently.</p>		
<p>Objective(s): The students will be able to correctly identify story structure (plot, characters, and setting) within their groups The students will be able to read and comprehend a short passage on a third grade level with 95% accuracy</p>		
Before	During	After
<p>Engagement Construct: <i>Relevance in Work</i></p> <p>Innovative Instructional Strategy: <i>Hand up-Pair up-Share Up</i></p> <p>Pass back their learning slips from yesterday's videos.</p> <p><i>Reread your learning from yesterday. It is time to share out something you learned. Let's do Hand up Pair up-Share up! You need to share with three people. Once you are done, return to your seat!</i></p>	<p>Engagement Constructs: <i>Relevance in work</i> <i>Construct meaning</i> <i>Scaffolds</i> <i>Collaboration</i></p> <p>Motivational Constructs: <i>Hands-on activities</i> <i>Interesting texts</i> <i>Collaboration to learn from text</i></p> <p><i>Today, we are going to apply your learning about story structure in groups. We are doing a Jigsaw today! Each group will have a different story to read, but all groups will fill out the same graphic organizer. When we are done with this, you will go back to your table groups and share out your learning and plot plan. Monitor and clarify for groups as needed.</i></p>	<p><i>Take out your Please Do Now from the other day. Draw a line under what you wrote. Underneath this line, please add any new thinking you might have about the question since we have begun reading and interacting with the story.</i></p>

Day 4		
PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.3.4.B Cite relevant details from text to support what the text says explicitly and make inferences. CC.1.3.4.K Read and comprehend literary fiction on grade level, reading independently and proficiently.		
Objective(s): The students will be able to correctly identify how to make inferences from text The students will correctly answer the comprehension questions from grade-level text about inferring; both aloud and in writing		
Before	During	After
<p>Engagement Construct: <i>Relevance in Work</i></p> <p>Please Do Now Collins Type 1</p> <p><i>In 129 seconds, write everything you know about inferring and predicting on the paper.</i></p> <p><i>Draw a line under what you wrote. We will be adding information to your paper!</i></p>	<p>Motivational Construct: <i>Strategy Instruction</i></p> <p><i>Look at page 172 in your book and follow along as I read the box at the bottom to you: “When you infer, you try to figure out something that is not directly stated in the text.”</i></p> <p><i>So, authors do not always tell us exactly what is happening in the story! Instead, the readers must figure out what is happening based on the text evidence. Let’s think about the answer to this question: What words and phrases does the author use to make Phillips seem like a real newsman? What do these words and phrases mean in this context? (Phillips tells Wilmuth to “step closer” because Wilmuth needs to be closer to the microphone so that radio listeners can hear him. He says, “ladies and gentlemen,” which is a</i></p>	<p><i>Using your Please Do Now Paper, write one new thing you learned from today’s lesson on inferring and predicting!</i></p>

	<p>formal way to introduce Wilmuth.)</p> <p><i>Now, think about what Wilmuth was listening to on the radio at the beginning of the story. What was he listening to?</i> (a professor who was talking about Mars.)</p> <p><i>Why might that be important to the story?</i> (It might be important because the title of the play is Invasion from Mars and the cylinder that crash-landed might be from Mars.)</p> <p><i>At your tables, please answer the following questions on the paper. Go to page 180 in your book and pay attention to the last paragraph that begins with "One man wants..." and ends with, "Listen: (long pause)." Only one person needs to be the recorder! Monitor as groups work. Redirect as needed.</i></p> <p>Innovative Instructional Strategy: <i>Whip Around</i></p>	
--	--	--

Day 5		
PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.3.4.B Cite relevant details from text to support what the text says explicitly and make inferences. CC.1.3.4.K Read and comprehend literary fiction on grade level, reading independently and proficiently.		
Objective(s): The students will make inferences using videos and a graphic organizer with their partner with 80% accuracy.		
Before	During	After
<i>Let's talk about our learning from yesterday.</i> <i>Turn and talk to your shoulder partner and share what you remember about inferring and predicting.</i>	Motivational Constructs: <i>Organizing Graphically</i> <i>Strategy Instruction</i> Engagement Constructs: <i>Relevance in Work</i> <i>Construct Meaning</i> <i>Collaboration</i> <i>Today, we are going to practice inferring with short videos!</i> <i>You should all have a GO that is two-sided. We will do one side together, and the other side will be with a partner.</i> <i>Our first video is called "Birds on a Wire."</i> <i>We will watch it and pause to make inferences.</i> https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k2PJ6T7U2eU&list=PL3L2MukeY2oQXRbgfse7b4fVWSgu7cccR Using your Chromebook, log onto Mrs. Singer's ELA Classroom and select one of the other inference videos to watch. Complete the GO	Homework: Making Inferences About Awesome Animals

	<p>with your partner. Bye Bye: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=a7arGFUT0uU&list=PLnygmwDd11_RwNnznycvJ6RBIj6mhovpX</p> <p>Geri's Game: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9IYRC7g2ICg&list=PLnygmwDd11_RwNnznycvJ6RBIj6mhovpX&index=4</p> <p>Pigeons: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oIIIVFBBbNw&list=PLnygmwDd11_RwNnznycvJ6RBIj6mhovpX&index=8</p> <p>Lifted: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dWAERJhHL4w&list=PLnygmwDd11_RwNznycvJ6RBIj6mhovpX&index=18</p> <p>Dug's Special Mission: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CKEEaFg6DS8&list=PLnygmwDd11_RwNnznycvJ6RBIj6mhovpX&index=23</p>	
--	---	--

Lesson Plan Overview <i>Journeys: Unit 2: Lesson 7: Coming Distractions</i>				Teacher: Sarah Palazzi
				School: Valley Elementary School
				Subject: ELA
PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.2.4.H Explain how an author uses reasons and evidence to support particular points in a text. CC.1.2.4.L Read and comprehend literary nonfiction and informational text on grade level, reading independently and proficiently CC.1.2.4.A Determine the main idea of a text and explain how it is supported by key details; summarize the text.				
Objective(s): The students will understand the difference between fact and opinion The students will successfully construct fact and opinion with 90% accuracy The students will understand the difference between fact and opinion The students will successfully construct fact and opinion with 90% accuracy The students will understand how authors use facts to support their opinions The students will correctly identify the characteristics of a summary The students will summarize a section of text with groups with 90% of groups successfully summarizing The students will apply their knowledge of summaries to the text The students will summarize four sections of the text with 90% accuracy The students will evaluate their own work and peers' work The students will apply grade-level skills (summary) to text of their choosing				
Engagement Constructs	Motivational Constructs	Skill/ Strategy	Innovative Instructional Practices	Materials
Relevance in Work Construct Meaning Scaffolding Interpersonal Relationships Collaboration	Strategy Instruction Organizing Graphically Collaboration to learn from text Autonomy Hands-on Activities Interesting Text	Fact/ Opinion Summarize	Whip Around Graffiti Wall Gallery Walk Jigsaw	Student Anthology Teacher's Edition Unit 2 Please Do Now Day 1 Projectable 7.2 T-Map: Fact and Opinion

	Choices and Control			(two for each student) Fact or Opinion Center Sticky Notes Butcher Paper Summary Practice text Stickers
--	---------------------	--	--	---

Day 1		
PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.2.4.H Explain how an author uses reasons and evidence to support particular points in a text. CC.1.2.4.L Read and comprehend literary nonfiction and informational text on grade level, reading independently and proficiently		
Objective(s): The students will understand the difference between fact and opinion The students will successfully construct fact and opinion with 90% accuracy		
Before	During	After
Engagement Construct: <i>Relevance in Work</i> Please Do Now: Collins Type 1 <i>In 100 seconds, define fact and opinion on your paper.</i> <i>Turn and talk to your shoulder partner. Share what you have and listen to your partner. If you would like to add something, add it at the bottom!</i>	Motivation Constructs: <i>Strategy Instruction</i> <i>Organizing Graphically</i> Pass out Projectable 7.2 T-Map: Fact and Opinion <i>We are going to write the definitions of fact and opinion in these boxes.</i> <i>A fact is a statement that can be proven true by checking a reference book or another resource.</i> <i>An opinion is a statement that expresses a thought or belief.</i> <i>Let's watch the following video. Add notes to your paper from Tim and Moby!</i> View the video: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1Nkj2Lx-Ks <i>Now we are going to read our anchor text, Coming Distractions. As you follow along, be thinking about facts and opinions that you hear. You may take notes on your T-chart if you wish!</i>	Engagement Construct: <i>Collaboration</i> <i>Relevance in Work</i> <i>Construct Meaning</i> With the people at your table, create one fact and one opinion to add to your T-chart. It can be made up, or you can use the text for ideas.

Day 2		
PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.2.4.H Explain how an author uses reasons and evidence to support particular points in a text. CC.1.2.4.L Read and comprehend literary nonfiction and informational text on grade level, reading independently and proficiently		
Objective(s): The students will understand the difference between fact and opinion The students will successfully construct fact and opinion with 90% accuracy The students will understand how authors use facts to support their opinions		
Before	During	After
Engagement Construct: <i>Construct Meaning</i> <i>Scaffolding</i> <i>Interpersonal Relationships</i> Motivation Construct: <i>Hands-on Activities</i> Fact or Opinion Center activity Use Projectable 7.2 and statements from the story as the sort. <i>We are going to complete a fact and opinion sort today. When your group is finished with the sort, raise your hand and Mrs. Singer or I will come check your work!</i>	Motivation Construct: <i>Collaboration to learn from text</i> <i>Autonomy</i> Engagement Construct: <i>Construct Meaning</i> <i>Scaffolding</i> <i>Please open your reading book to page 205.</i> <i>We are going to answer the Analyze the Text question in the middle of this page. Read it silently as I read it aloud, “Fact and Opinion: What reasons does the author give to support the opinion he shares in the first sentence?”</i> <i>Ok, let’s look back to the first paragraph and reread now that we have a purpose for our reading. (Read aloud)</i> Think aloud: <i>Hmm. so his opinion is “Sometimes movies leave things out that</i>	When students finish, have them put their sticky notes on the butcher paper hanging on the back chalkboard. Read aloud and evaluate answers as a class. Save sticky notes for beginning of tomorrow’s lesson!

	<p><i>would make them lose momentum.” I get that. When I think about Avengers: Endgame, I think about how boring it would be to watch people put the Avengers facility back together after Thanos destroys it. So what reasons does the author give me to support his opinion for other movies?</i></p> <p>Distribute sticky notes</p> <p><i>With your fluency partner, you are going to write one reason the author gives for his opinion. Make sure you read both paragraphs on page 205! No names on stickies and only one sticky per group!</i></p>	
--	---	--

Day 3		
<p>PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.2.4.A Determine the main idea of a text and explain how it is supported by key details; summarize the text. CC.1.2.4.H Explain how an author uses reasons and evidence to support particular points in a text. CC.1.2.4.L Read and comprehend literary nonfiction and informational text on grade level, reading independently and proficiently</p>		
<p>Objective(s): The students will correctly identify the characteristics of a summary The students will summarize a section of text with groups with 90% of groups successfully summarizing</p>		
Before	During	After
<p>Review yesterday's answers and reteach as needed.</p> <p>Turn and talk: what is a summary?</p>	<p>Motivation Constructs: <i>Strategy Instruction</i></p> <p>Read the bottom of page 200 aloud as they follow along: <i>A summary is when you briefly restate the most important ideas in your own words. Summarizing can help you understand and remember what you read. As we reread "Coming Distractions," we will stop after each section to summarize the important parts of the text and to confirm our understanding.</i></p> <p>Listen to the story.</p> <p>Stop at the bottom of page 206. Follow along in the Teacher Edition with the Target Strategy language to model a summary.</p> <p>Listen to page 207. Have students talk in their tables</p>	<p>Turn and talk: Summarize summaries!</p>

	<p>to summarize the important information from the section <i>How Does the Message Get My Attention?</i></p> <p>Provide corrective feedback as necessary</p> <p>Finish the story.</p>	
--	---	--

Day 4		
<p>PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.2.4.A Determine the main idea of a text and explain how it is supported by key details; summarize the text. CC.1.2.4.H Explain how an author uses reasons and evidence to support particular points in a text. CC.1.2.4.L Read and comprehend literary nonfiction and informational text on grade level, reading independently and proficiently</p>		
<p>Objective(s): The students will apply their knowledge of summaries to the text The students will summarize four sections of the text with 90% accuracy</p>		
Before	During	After
<p>Innovative Instructional Strategy: <i>Whip Around</i></p> <p>After a brief time to brainstorm, ask each table what they remember about summarizing.</p>	<p>Innovative Instructional Strategy: <i>Graffiti Wall</i></p> <p>Motivation Constructs: <i>Hands-on Activity</i> <i>Collaboration to learn from text</i></p> <p>Engagement Constructs: <i>Relevance in Work</i> <i>Construct meaning</i> <i>Interpersonal Relationships</i> <i>Collaboration</i></p> <p><i>Summarize the main ideas of the listed headings with your table. When you finish, place the sticky note on the correct paper!</i></p> <p>Headings to use: The “Numbing” Effect Painting a “Bad” Picture Mixing Up a Movie Jolts Per Minute</p>	<p>Have groups reread their sticky notes and make any changes they deem necessary.</p>

Day 5		
<p>PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.2.4.A Determine the main idea of a text and explain how it is supported by key details; summarize the text. CC.1.2.4.H Explain how an author uses reasons and evidence to support particular points in a text. CC.1.2.4.L Read and comprehend literary nonfiction and informational text on grade level, reading independently and proficiently</p>		
<p>Objective(s): The students will evaluate their own work and peers' work</p>		
Before	During	After
<p>Innovative Instructional Strategy: <i>Gallery Walk</i></p> <p>Have students walk around and read each summary on the paper.</p>	<p>Engagement Construct: <i>Relevance in Work</i></p> <p>Give each student four stickers and have them place one sticker on each butcher paper next to the summary they think is the best.</p> <p>Read summaries aloud and discuss the strengths and weaknesses.</p>	<p>Capture the main ideas from all the summary lessons. Explain to students they will be working more with summaries tomorrow.</p>

Day 6		
<p>PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.2.4.A Determine the main idea of a text and explain how it is supported by key details; summarize the text. CC.1.2.4.H Explain how an author uses reasons and evidence to support particular points in a text. CC.1.2.4.L Read and comprehend literary nonfiction and informational text on grade level, reading independently and proficiently</p>		
<p>Objective(s): The students will apply grade-level skills (summary) to text of their choosing</p>		
Before	During	After
Review Jigsaw by asking students what they remember about the activity and expectations while working.	<p>Innovative Instructional Strategy: <i>Jigsaw</i></p> <p>Motivation Constructs: <i>Hands-on Activity</i> <i>Interesting Text</i> <i>Collaboration to learn from text</i> <i>Autonomy</i> <i>Choices and Control</i></p> <p>Engagement Constructs: <i>Relevance in work</i> <i>Construct Meaning</i> <i>Collaboration</i></p> <p><i>Today, we are going to jigsaw a few nonfiction articles to help us practice our new skill of summarizing!</i> <i>You are allowed to choose your group.</i> <i>Here are the rules:</i> <i>Each group must consist of at least 4 members; no more than 5</i> <i>Each group must be a mix of boys and girls</i></p>	Create new groups (one of each article in the new groups) and have students share their title and summary.

	<p><i>If your group is off-task (talking), then you will complete your summaries alone.</i></p> <p><i>Here are your options:</i></p> <p><i>The Mimic</i> <i>Sharks</i> <i>Butterflies</i> <i>The Mysterious Squid</i> <i>Welcome to the Taiga Biome</i></p> <p>After students choose their groups, each group can choose their article, but <i>once an article is claimed, you can no longer choose it! So have a few choices ready in your group.</i></p> <p>Students work collaboratively to read the text and summarize it together.</p> <p>Monitor, clarify, and redirect as needed!</p>	
--	--	--

Lesson Plan Overview <i>Journeys: Unit 2: Lesson 8: Me and Uncle Romie</i>			Teacher: Sarah Palazzi	
			School: Valley Elementary School	
			Subject: ELA	
PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.3.4.C Describe in depth a character, setting, or event in a story or drama, drawing on specific details in the text. CC.1.3.4.K Read and comprehend literary fiction on grade level, reading independently and proficiently. CC.1.3.4.K Read and comprehend literary fiction on grade level, reading independently and proficiently. CC.1.3.4.B Cite relevant details from text to support what the text says explicitly and make inferences. CC.1.3.4.C Describe in depth a character, setting, or event in a story or drama, drawing on specific details in the text.				
Objective(s): The learner will be able to use text details to visualize characters and setting at different points in the story The learner will be able to work with a pair to complete a visualization graphic organizer The learner will be able to understand characters The learner will identify three main aspects when understanding characters: thoughts, actions, and words The learner will use a graphic organizer to organize their thinking about the character				
Engagement Constructs	Motivati-onal Constructs	Skill/ Strategy	Innovative Instructional Practices	Materials
Construct Meaning	Strategy Instruction	Understand ing Characters	Turn and Talk Hand up-Pair up- Share up	Student Reading Book
Scaffolds	Organizing Graphically	Visualizing	Whip Around Jigsaw	Teacher Edition Unit 2
Collaboration	Collaboratio n to Learn From Text			Visualizing Graphic Organizer
Interpersonal Relationships				
Relevance in	Hands-on			Projectable 8.2

Work	activities Interesting Text			<p>Leveled Readers and corresponding GO:</p> <p>Recipe for Learning (Blackline Master 8.5) Gramps' Favorite Gift (Blackline Master 8.6) Stuck at Camp (Blackline Master 8.7) A Gift for Grandpa (Blackline Master 8.8)</p>
------	---------------------------------------	--	--	--

Day 1		
<p>PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.3.4.C Describe in depth a character, setting, or event in a story or drama, drawing on specific details in the text. CC.1.3.4.K Read and comprehend literary fiction on grade level, reading independently and proficiently.</p>		
<p>Objective(s): The learner will be able to use text details to visualize characters and setting at different points in the story The learner will be able to work with a pair to complete a visualization graphic organizer</p>		
Before	During	After
<p>Innovative Instructional Strategy: <i>Turn and Talk</i></p> <p><i>For the next 15 seconds, I want you to think about what it means to visualize while you read.</i></p> <p>After they think say: <i>Turn and talk to the person next to you and share your thinking.</i></p> <p>Allow students to share with their shoulder partner <i>Who would like to share what they and their partner said about visualizing?</i></p> <p>Call on students with hands raised.</p>	<p>Motivation Construct: <i>Strategy Instruction</i></p> <p>Engagement Construct: <i>Construct Meaning</i></p> <p><i>Open your reading books to page 228 and follow along at the bottom of the page as I read aloud to you:</i> To visualize, use details from the text to form a picture in your mind. As you read “Me and Uncle Romie,” use details in the text to help you picture the characters, the places they go, and the things they do. Visualizing characters, settings, and events can help you better understand the story.</p> <p><i>As we listen to the story for the first time, be thinking about how the details paint a picture in your mind of what is happening.</i></p>	<p>Motivation Constructs: <i>Organizing Graphically</i> <i>Collaboration to Learn From Text</i></p> <p>Engagement Constructs: <i>Scaffolds</i> <i>Collaboration</i> <i>Interpersonal Relationships</i></p> <p>Looking at pages 238-239 with your fluency partner, fill out the graphic organizer.</p>

	<p>Listen to the story. Stop on page 234 and do a think aloud:</p> <p><i>James hears heavy footsteps in the hall. He says “a giant” stares at him from the doorway. It’s Uncle Romie. James says Uncle Romie has a voice like thunder. So, I picture James looking up at his uncle in the dark, James can’t see his uncle’s face. I picture Uncle Romie as a large man with a loud, booming voice.</i></p> <p><i>What did you visualize?</i></p> <p>Continue with the first read of the story.</p>	
--	--	--

Day 2		
<p>PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.3.4.K Read and comprehend literary fiction on grade level, reading independently and proficiently. CC.1.3.4.B Cite relevant details from text to support what the text says explicitly and make inferences. CC.1.3.4.C Describe in depth a character, setting, or event in a story or drama, drawing on specific details in the text.</p>		
<p>Objective(s): The learner will be able to understand characters The learner will identify three main aspects when understanding characters: thoughts, actions, and words The learner will use a graphic organizer to organize their thinking about the character</p>		
Before	During	After
<p>Innovative Instructional Strategy: <i>Hand up-Pair up-Share up</i></p> <p><i>Find two partners and share the three main parts we consider when trying to understand characters.</i></p>	<p>Motivation Constructs: <i>Strategy Instruction</i> <i>Organizing Graphically</i></p> <p>Engagement Constructs: <i>Scaffolds</i></p> <p><i>Who would like to share out what you learned and shared with your partner?</i> Answer: thoughts, actions, and words</p> <p><i>As we listen to “Me and Uncle Romie,” pay attention to what the main character says, thinks, and does so we can try to understand him.</i></p> <p>Second read of the story. Stop at the bottom of page 236 and ask Analyze the Text question: <i>Understanding Characters- How does James’s opinion of Uncle Romie change throughout the story? What</i></p>	<p>Finish the GO together. Use this time to redirect any students who missed or are still not understanding differences between thoughts, actions, and words.</p>

	<p><i>thoughts and words does James use that show his change of opinion?</i></p> <p><i>Using what we've read so far today, what does James think about Uncle Romie? (big and has a deep voice; makes him a little scary. James thinks he only cares about his artwork.)</i></p> <p><i>Pass out Projectable 8.2. We are going to use this to track our thinking about James's thoughts, actions, and words in order to help us understand him.</i></p> <p><i>As we listen to the story, we will stop and jot down our thinking and text evidence.</i></p>	
--	--	--

Day 3		
<p>PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.3.4.K Read and comprehend literary fiction on grade level, reading independently and proficiently. CC.1.3.4.B Cite relevant details from text to support what the text says explicitly and make inferences. CC.1.3.4.C Describe in depth a character, setting, or event in a story or drama, drawing on specific details in the text.</p>		
<p>Objective(s): The learner will be able to understand characters The learner will identify three main aspects when understanding characters: thoughts, actions, and words The learner will use a graphic organizer to organize their thinking about the character</p>		
Before	During	After
<p>Innovative Instructional Strategy: <i>Whip Around</i></p> <p><i>What three things are important to look for when trying to understand characters? Turn and talk and then whip around!</i></p>	<p>Innovative Instructional Strategy: <i>Jigsaw</i></p> <p>Motivation Constructs: <i>Hands-on activities</i> <i>Collaboration to learn from text</i> <i>Interesting Text</i> <i>Organizing Graphically</i></p> <p>Engagement Constructs: <i>Relevance in Work</i> <i>Scaffolds</i> <i>Construct Meaning</i> <i>Interpersonal Relationships</i> <i>Collaboration</i></p> <p>Using the readers that come with the series, break the students up into four groups. I will mix them up heterogeneously so that learning from a more knowledgeable other will take place. Distribute stories that focus on understanding</p>	<p>Have each table share one thing they learned from a peer.</p> <p>*This lesson may take two days to complete.</p>

	<p>characters. Give students the GO that goes with their book to complete with their groups. Break out of expert groups back into table groups to share their GO with their tables.</p>	
--	---	--

Lesson Plan Overview <i>Journeys: Unit 2: Lesson 9: Dear Mr. Winston</i>		Teacher: Sarah Palazzi		
		School: Valley Elementary School		
		Subject: ELA		
PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.3.4.B Cite relevant details from text to support what the text says explicitly and make inferences. CC.1.3.4.C Describe in depth a character, setting, or event in a story or drama, drawing on specific details in the text. CC.1.3.4.J Acquire and use accurately grade appropriate conversational, general academic, and domain-specific words and phrases, including those that signal precise actions, emotions, or states of being and that are basic to a particular topic. CC.1.3.4.K Read and comprehend literary fiction on grade level, reading independently and proficiently.				
Objective(s): The learner will understand the importance of questioning while reading The learner will generate his/her own questions from the reading The learners will work together to understand characters The learners will understand the connection between understanding characters and making generalizations The learner will create generalizations from the text and support with evidence				
Engagement Constructs	Motivational Constructs	Skill/ Strategy	Innovative Instructional Practices	Materials
Scaffolds Relevance in Work Construct Meaning Interpersonal relationships Collaboration Choice	Strategy Instruction Autonomy Choices and Control Collaboration to learn from text Hands-on Activity Organizing Graphically	Conclusions and Generalizations Question	Turn and Talk Whip Around Hand up-Pair up- Share up Graffiti Wall Gallery Walk	Student Book Teacher Book Scrap paper for jotting Butcher paper Labels for paper: Thoughts Actions Words Projectable 9.2 Leveled Readers <i>Painting the Ocean</i>

				<p>Blackline Master 9.5 <i>Soccer Sisters</i></p> <p>Blackline Master 9.6 <i>Think Before You Speak</i></p> <p>Blackline Master 9.7</p>
--	--	--	--	---

Day 1		
<p>PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.3.4.B Cite relevant details from text to support what the text says explicitly and make inferences. CC.1.3.4.C Describe in depth a character, setting, or event in a story or drama, drawing on specific details in the text. CC.1.3.4.J Acquire and accurately use grade appropriate conversational, general academic, and domain-specific words and phrases, including those that signal precise actions, emotions, or states of being and that are basic to a particular topic. CC.1.3.4.K Read and comprehend literary fiction on grade level, reading independently and proficiently.</p>		
<p>Objective(s): The learner will understand the importance of questioning while reading The learner will generate his/her own questions from the reading</p>		
Before	During	After
<p>Innovative Instructional Strategy: <i>Turn and Talk</i> <i>Whip Around</i></p> <p><i>Why might asking questions as you read be a good strategy to use?</i> (Helps to draw conclusions and make generalizations.) Call on students to answer</p> <p>Extend by saying that when we question, we are also trying to understand characters by asking about their thoughts, actions, and words.</p>	<p>Motivation Construct: <i>Strategy Instruction</i></p> <p>Innovative Instructional Strategy: <i>Turn and Talk</i></p> <p>Engagement Construct: <i>Scaffolds</i></p> <p><i>Open your book to page 258 and follow along at the bottom as I read aloud "Target Strategy." (Read bottom of page 258 aloud). We are now going to listen to the story. Follow along with the text as we listen.</i></p> <p>Stop at the bottom of page 262. <i>I want you to think about what you learned on this page and what questions you have about the story. Jot this</i></p>	<p>Innovative Instructional Strategy: <i>Hand up-Pair up-Share up</i></p> <p>Engagement Construct: <i>Relevance in Work</i> <i>Construct Meaning</i> <i>Interpersonal relationships</i> <i>Collaboration</i> <i>Choice</i></p> <p>Motivation Construct: <i>Autonomy</i> <i>Choices and Control</i> <i>Collaboration to learn from text</i></p> <p><i>On your own, write one or two questions you have about Cara from the story. Then, we will do Hand up-Pair up-</i></p>

	<p><i>down on your paper.</i></p> <p>After some time, model the question strategy for them: <i>The beginning of the letter raises many questions about what happened at the library. One question I have is why Cara took a snake into the library.</i></p> <p>Would anyone like to share what they jotted?</p> <p>Stop at the bottom of page 265. Have students jot any questions they have. Turn and talk to their partner. Finish listening to the story</p>	<p><i>Share up to share our questions with three people. Answer your partner's question!</i></p>
--	---	--

Days 2 & 3		
<p>PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.3.4.B Cite relevant details from text to support what the text says explicitly and make inferences. CC.1.3.4.C Describe in depth a character, setting, or event in a story or drama, drawing on specific details in the text. CC.1.3.4.J Acquire and use accurately grade appropriate conversational, general academic, and domain-specific words and phrases, including those that signal precise actions, emotions, or states of being and that are basic to a particular topic. CC.1.3.4.K Read and comprehend literary fiction on grade level, reading independently and proficiently.</p>		
<p>Objective(s): The learners will work together to understand characters The learners will understand the connection between understanding characters and making generalizations The learner will create generalizations from the text and support with evidence</p>		
Before	During	After
<p>Innovative Instructional Strategy: <i>Graffiti Wall</i> <i>Gallery Walk</i></p> <p>Motivation Construct: <i>Hands-on Activity</i> <i>Autonomy</i> <i>Choices and control</i></p> <p>Hang up three pieces of butcher paper around the room. Label each one with the following: thoughts, actions, words.</p> <p><i>Today, we are going to use the questions we asked yesterday to help us make conclusions or generalizations today.</i></p>	<p>Motivation Construct: <i>Strategy Instruction</i> <i>Organizing Graphically</i> <i>Collaboration to Learn From Text</i></p> <p>Engagement Construct: <i>Construct Meaning</i> <i>Scaffolds</i></p> <p><i>Open your book to page 258 and put your finger on the blue text that says: "Target Skill."</i></p> <p>Read the top of page 258 aloud to students and discuss the graphic organizer on the page. Explain to students we will be filling out a GO just like this today.</p> <p>Listen to the story a second</p>	<p>Innovative Instructional Strategy: <i>Whip Around</i></p> <p><i>Whip around! I want to hear something from each group! Be prepared to share your text evidence!</i></p>

<p><i>Using the butcher paper and a marker, walk around and add your questions, comments, or thoughts about Cara you formulated yesterday.</i></p> <p>Once students finish, invite students to take a Gallery Walk and read classmates' responses.</p>	<p>time.</p> <p>Stop at the bottom of page 265 and post the following questions on the board:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What does Cara keep repeating to Mr. Winston? 2. Does Cara seem genuinely sorry? Why or why not? 3. What text evidence do you have that Cara is not genuinely sorry? <p>Have students do jot dots for each question. When finished, explain: <i>These questions will help us understand Cara, which will then help us make generalizations about her. Keep your jots on the corner of your desk!</i></p> <p>Continue listening to the story. Stop at the bottom of page 269 and discuss the Analyze the Text question: <i>Look at the first paragraph. What conclusion can you draw about the letter writer's attitude from her suggestions to Mr. Winston? What details and examples lead you to this conclusion?</i></p> <p>Distribute Projectable 9.2. Ask: <i>What conclusion can you draw about Cara's attitude from her suggestions to Mr. Winston?</i> (Cara seems to be finding fault with Mr. Winston's actions). Once students get to that answer, have them write that on their projectable in the</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Conclusion or Generalization box.</p> <p><i>Working at your tables, find two pieces of text evidence to support this generalization.</i> (Cara questions why Mr. Winston came to help her when she didn't need help; why he looked in the box if he was afraid of snakes).</p>	
--	---	--

Days 4 & 5		
<p>PA State Standard(s) Addressed: CC.1.3.4.B Cite relevant details from text to support what the text says explicitly and make inferences. CC.1.3.4.C Describe in depth a character, setting, or event in a story or drama, drawing on specific details in the text. CC.1.3.4.J Acquire and use accurately grade appropriate conversational, general academic, and domain-specific words and phrases, including those that signal precise actions, emotions, or states of being and that are basic to a particular topic. CC.1.3.4.K Read and comprehend literary fiction on grade level, reading independently and proficiently.</p>		
<p>Objective(s): The learners will work together to understand characters The learners will understand the connection between understanding characters and making generalizations The learner will create generalizations from the text and support with evidence</p>		
Before	During	After
<p>Review:</p> <p><i>Great work yesterday! When making generalizations, what should we always support them with?</i> Text evidence</p>	<p>Motivation Construct: <i>Organizing Graphically Collaboration to Learn From Text</i></p> <p>Engagement Construct: <i>Construct Meaning Scaffolds</i> <i>Relevance in Work</i> <i>Interpersonal Relationships</i></p> <p><i>Today you're going to work in groups to read one of these three books and create your own conclusions/generalizations from your reading. Remember, you need two pieces of text evidence to support your answer!</i></p> <p>Leveled Readers to practice generating conclusions or generalizations and using text evidence to support</p>	<p>Innovative Instructional Strategy: Hand up-Pair up-Share up</p> <p>Once all groups are finished, have them engage in Hand up-Pair up-Share up with three people not from their group to share their findings.</p>

	<p>them. Use the graphic organizers that are specific to each book. Students will be grouped by center groups. This way, the students who need challenged can read the Above Level Leveled Reader (<i>Think Before You Speak</i>); students on level will read the On Level Leveled Reader (<i>Soccer Sisters</i>), and students who need more support will read the Struggling Readers Leveled Reader (<i>Painting the Ocean</i>). All books focus on the same skill.</p> <p>Float and redirect as needed. This may take two days.</p>	
--	---	--

Appendix B Tracking Sheet Example

Example of the tracking sheet used for Lesson 6, Day 1 video data

Key	What words and phrases does the author use to make Phillips seem like a real newsman?	How does that help us, in this context, understand what's happening?	What was Wilmuth listening to on the radio?	"Listening to the radio, kinda- half ways..." What do you think that means?	Look at the pictures. What things in the illustration are described in the text? How about something that is not described in the text?	Do you know what cylindrical means? (pause) Where can you look?	How does the dialogue help you picture the setting?
V: volunteered							
X: incorrect answer							
C: correct answer							
Number							
17	[VX]			V	V	V V	V
1						V	
3		[VX]					
13							
6							
15			[VX]	V		V V	[VX] redirect [X]
7							

12	[VC]			V	[VC]		
19			[VX]				[VC]
8							
18				V	V	V	[VC]
14							
11						V	
4		[VX]	V	V	[VC]	V	
10							
5		[VX]	[VC]	V	[VC]	V	[VC]
2		[VC]			[VC]	[VX VC]	V
20							
22				[VC]			
9						[VX]	
16							
*21: Absent							

Appendix C Reflections

Stories and examples of behaviors during whole group instruction and during innovative instructional practices

Invasion from Mars

When I looked at my reflection from the first story of the intervention, *Invasion From Mars*, I found that seatwork with a partner did not go as well as planned. Students needed constant redirection to complete the task. I needed to reteach and reread directions several times in order for the question to be answered: “How does the dialogue help you picture the setting of the play?” Students focused more on dialogue and not putting the two parts of the question together. During this time, a lot of students were not engaged. They displayed this unengaged behavior by playing with pencils, not knowing where we were in the book, and talking about weekend plans. Although, on day 3 of the *Invasion from Mars* component we did a Jigsaw with passages on a third and fourth grade level. They worked in small groups to apply the skills we had learned the day before about story structure. They needed some guidance for plot; they needed to be told to focus on the beginning, middle, and end, but were able to complete it. Behaviors I witnessed that showed kids were on task, include: taking turns reading, writing together after discussion, and asking their group members to repeat what was said so they could scribe it correctly.

Another example was noted during Day 4 of the *Invasion from Mars*. I tried group work for comprehension questions. These questions were all text-based questions from *Journeys* in the

Teacher Edition. They had four questions to answer in their small groups, and it was hard for the majority of the groups to finish in the time allotted for this comprehension activity. The questions were as follows: How does the illustration reflect the time period in which the play takes place?; What argument does Professor Pierson make for why the cylinder might be a meteor?; What argument does Professor Pierson give for why the cylinder might NOT be a meteor?; What does this tell you about the object? All of the answers could be found in the text, with the exception of the fourth question. They needed to take the information from questions 1-3 and analyze what that told them about the object. Most groups missed at least two, if not all four questions. To me, this says that even though they are completing a task with collaboration from peers, if the group members do not have a basic understanding of what the text says, and understand the questions being asked, they will not be able to effectively complete the assignment. During this activity, I found students on task; looking up answers and writing, but I found that my striving learners, the ones who don't always volunteer and who struggle with grade-level material, were off-task; dancing, talking to other group members, and flipping through the reading book.

Coming Distractions

Day 1 of Coming Distractions utilized one Innovative Instructional Practice (Please Do Now), two motivation constructs (Organizing Graphically and Strategy Instruction), and three engagement constructs (Collaboration, Relevance in Work, and Constructing Meaning). This lesson did not involve reading the story, rather this lesson set up the skills for this story. We focused on fact and opinion; learning the difference between the two and generating fact and opinions during group work. Please Do Now yielded the same six students volunteering who

have consistently volunteered throughout this whole process. Further, the motivation and engagement constructs generated the same actions as Please Do Now: not volunteering. While they all watched the video and listened to many examples of fact and opinion, they still did not understand the difference between the two.

On Day 2, I used motivation and engagement constructs and no innovative instructional practices. First, the groups completed a sort, which took a while because the students were discussing why certain statements were facts and why others were opinions. This showed me that, even in the absence of innovative instructional practices, engagement can happen.

Another example of engaged behaviors occurred while students were participating in an innovative instructional practice on days 5 and 6 during the story, Coming Distractions. In this exercise, students first chose their own groups to complete a Jigsaw. The skill for the story was summarizing and it proved difficult for them. I scaffolded a lot for the students during the exercise because they wanted to retell the story instead of summarizing it, the latter being a harder skill. To help students, at the end of the story, I selected nonfiction texts about animals that were on a third or fourth grade level and asked them to read the texts in their self-selected groups. Most groups were on task, but one group of students really struggled. None of them wanted to get started and no one would take the lead. Eventually, with redirection from me, they managed to get a plan in place and begin. Once they started, they were able to talk to each other and write their summaries. An important note about Jigsaw—once you're done with your "expert" group, you have to go back to your "home" group and share what you learned. Thus, it is very important for students to be on task and paying attention to what their group members are doing, so that everyone has the same information. While circulating, I found students to be writing, discussing, and checking in on each other to make sure everyone was copying the

summaries correctly. A handful of students were off task during this Innovative Instructional Practice, but the members of their group were quick to pull them back into working with the group. They did this by redirecting their group members, they asked if they were following along, pointed to their paper to help them find the correct area, and waited for them to catch up with the group.

Me and Uncle Romie

On Day 1 of Me and Uncle Romie, the Innovative Instructional Practice Turn and Talk was utilized, as well as direct instruction. Their prompt for Turn and Talk was, “For the next 15 seconds, I want you to think about what it means to visualize what you read.” After the time was up, they chatted with the people around them. Of the sixteen students present for today’s lesson, three needed redirection. As shown in video data, one student sat alone instead of joining a group close to her (this is common practice for them to join a group if their tablemates are absent), another played with his hands, and another student was not making eye contact with his group. Two of the three students were able to be redirected. Once we moved into the direct instruction part and read the text, I saw three of the sixteen students off task. One student got up to walk around and get a drink, the student from earlier who was playing with his fingers, decided to put his hands on his classmate’s book while following along with the read aloud, and another student was digging in her backpack. When we moved onto the Think Aloud portion of the lesson, two of the sixteen students had their heads down, ten out of the sixteen were facing me, and four of the sixteen appeared to not be engaged. Their behaviors included staring in the opposite direction, fiddling with hands, head in lap, and staring out of the window. All of these behaviors point to an unengaged lesson. While I have always believed in direct instruction to set baselines,

establish knowledge, and give examples, this appeared to be too long for them to remain engaged.

Day 3 of Me and Uncle Romie contained three innovative instructional practices; Turn and Talk, Whip Around and Jigsaw. The Whip Around question I posed was, “What three things are important to look for when trying to understand characters? Turn and Talk and then Whip Around!” Turn and Talk and Whip Around were not effective today because they could not remember what we did in class Friday. We had completed a sort on Friday all about the character's thoughts, words, and actions. When we moved about the room asking for answers, table one struggled at first when one student claimed no one discussed anything, but the other members were able to answer the question. Table two never spoke to each other to discuss the question, so they were unable to share when we got to their table. Table three repeated what they heard table one say, and tables four and five gave correct answers. The third Innovative Instructional Practice for the day was the beginning of Jigsaw. This Innovative Instructional Practice usually goes well in class; they like working in small groups, they keep each other on task, and they have good discussions. However, it did not go well for this lesson. They used the leveled readers from the series and it was too difficult for some of them. A lot of off-task behaviors occurred. For example, students spent the majority of the time arguing over what pages each of them were going to read.

Although the beginning of Jigsaw did not go well, they were able to complete the activity the next day. They worked better in groups - talking to each other and helping each other find their character's thoughts, words, and actions. When they returned to their home groups, they presented on-task behaviors as well as perseverance. Their on-task behaviors included eye contact with the person speaking and not talking while the other person was talking. The books

were long and difficult, but they eventually pulled together and completed the organizers correctly.

Dear Mr. Winston

At the beginning of *Dear Mr. Winston*, traditional question and answer was utilized to establish the importance of questioning events in the story as we read. During this time, the question, “Why is it important to ask questions as a reader?” was asked to all twenty-two students in the classroom. Of those twenty-two, only three volunteered to answer. Video evidence shows students off-task during this instruction. One student could be found drawing and writing on scraps of paper, while another one took his glasses off and was spinning them around in his hands. However, when the Innovative Instructional Practice of Turn and Talk was implemented, all students participated. They turned and talked to their partner and then were able to jot answers to the question, “The beginning of the letter raises many questions about what happened at the library. One question I have is why Cara took a snake into the library.” At the end of the lesson, another Innovative Instructional Practice was used. For this, Whip Around was used at the end of the lesson. Students were directed to write one or two questions they had about Cara from the story. After they jotted their questions, all students participated in Hand Up-Pair Up-Share Up. One student, who has demonstrated off-task behaviors throughout the duration of this lesson, was slow to begin, so he only shared with two people instead of three. However, when watching video data, all students were sharing their question with their three partners.

An example of engaged behaviors while completing an Innovative Instructional Practice, were the Jigsaw and Gallery Walk with the story, *Dear Mr. Winston*. Students first worked independently to find examples of Cara's thoughts, words, and actions, to prove that she was not

really sorry for her behaviors. The students displayed on-task behaviors: skimming the text, writing their findings on sticky notes, placing their sticky notes on the correct “wall,” and reading their classmates' findings. When we reconvened after the Gallery Walk, I asked them to share what they learned. A lot of the students shared sticky notes that they read from their classmates, instead of their own. To me, this shows engagement because they remembered what their classmates shared and found it valuable to their learning.

References

- Atkinson, J. W. (1957). Motivational determinants of risk-taking behavior. *Psychological Review*, 64(6, Pt.1), 359–372. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0043445>
- Bandura, A., & Schunk, D. H. (1981). Cultivating competence, self-efficacy, and intrinsic interest through proximal self-motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 41, 586–598.
- Barton, D. & Hamilton, M. (2000). Literacy practices. In D. Barton, M. Hamilton, & R. Ivanič (Eds.), *Situated literacies: Reading and writing in context* (pp. 7–15). Routledge.
- Becker, M., McElvany, N., & Kortenbruck, M. (2010). Intrinsic and extrinsic reading motivation as predictors of reading literacy: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(4), 773–785. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020084>
- Cantrell, S. C., Almasi, J. F., Rintamaa, M., Carter, J. C., Pennington, J., & Buckman, D. M. (2014). The impact of supplemental instruction on low-achieving adolescents' reading engagement. *Journal of Educational Research*, 107(1), 36–58. <https://doi.org/pitt.idm.oclc.org/10.1080/00220671.2012.753859>
- Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. (2020). *Pennsylvania system of school assessment*. [Standards-based assessment]. Author. <https://www.education.pa.gov/Documents/K-12/Assessment%20and%20Accountability/PSSA/Test%20Administration%20Materials/Paper%20Pencil%20DFAs/PSSA%20DFA%20-%20ELA%20Grade%204.pdf>
- De Naeghel, J., Van Keer, H., Vansteenkiste, M., & Rosseel, Y. (2012). The relation between elementary students' recreational and academic reading motivation, reading frequency, engagement, and comprehension: A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 104(4), 1006-1021. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/pitt.idm.oclc.org/10.1037/a0027800>
- Dillard, S. (2016, April 21). *Stand up-hand up-pair up*. Smore. <https://www.smores.com/agssym-stand-up-hand-up-pair-up>
- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 109–132. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135153>
- Guthrie, J. T., & Cox, K. E. (2001). Classroom conditions for motivation and engagement in reading. *Educational Psychology Review*, 13(3), 283–302. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/pitt.idm.oclc.org/10.1023/A:1016627907001>

- Guthrie, J. T., & Davis, M. H. (2003). Motivating struggling readers in middle school through an engagement model of classroom practice. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 19(1), 59-85. doi:10.1080/10573560308203
- Guthrie, J. T., Hoa, A. L. W., Wigfield, A., Tonks, S. M., Humenick, N. M., & Littles, E. (2007). Reading motivation and reading comprehension growth in the later elementary years. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 32(3), 282–313. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2006.05.004>
- Guthrie, J. T., Klauda, S. L., & Ho, A. N. (2013). Modeling the relationships among reading instruction, motivation, engagement, and achievement for adolescents. *Reading Research Quarterly*, (48)1, 9–26.
- Guthrie, J. T., Wigfield, A., Barbosa, P., Perencevich, K. C., Taboada, A., Davis, M. H., Scaffidi, N. T., & Tonks, S. (2004). Increasing reading comprehension and engagement through concept-oriented reading instruction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96(3), 403–423.
- Gutiérrez, K. D., & Rogoff, B. (2003). Cultural ways of learning: Individual traits or repertoires of practice. *Educational Researcher*, 32(5), 19–25.
- Harton, E. (n.d.). *Gallery walk*. The Teacher Toolkit. <http://www.theteachertoolkit.com/index.php/tool/gallery-walk>
- Jago, C., Palmer, E., Fountas, I., Vogt, M., Hougen, M. C., Templeton, S., & Valencia, S. W. (2017). *Journeys*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.
- Keene, E. O. (2018). *Engaging children*. Heinemann.
- Klauda, S. L., & Guthrie, J.T. (2014). Comparing relations of motivation, engagement, and achievement among struggling and advanced adolescent readers. *Reading and Writing*, (28)2, 239–269.
- Learned, J. E. (2016). The behavior kids: Examining the conflation of youth reading difficulty and behavior problem positioning among school institutional contexts. *American Educational Research Journal*, 53(5), 1271–1309.
- Logan, S., Medford, E., & Hughes, N. (2010). The importance of intrinsic motivation for high and low ability readers' reading comprehension performance. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 21(1), 124–128.
- Louick, R., Leider, C. M., Daley, S. G., Proctor, C. P., & Gardner, G. L. (2016). Motivation for reading among struggling middle school readers: A mixed methods study. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 49, 260–269.
- Marinak, B. A., & Gambrell, L. B. (2008). Intrinsic motivation and rewards: What sustains young children's engagement with text? *Literacy Research and Instruction*, 47, 9-26.

- Marzano, R. (2012). Art and science of teaching: The many uses of exit tickets. *Educational Leadership*, 70(2), 80–81.
- Marzano, R. J., & Pickering, D. J. (2010). *The highly engaged classroom*. ProQuest Ebook Central. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/pitt-ebooks/detail.action?docID=3404837>
- McGeown, S., Osborne, C., Warhurst, A., Norgate, R., & Duncan L. (2016). Understanding children's reading activities: Reading motivation, skill and child characteristics as predictors. *Journal of Research in Reading*, 39(1), 109–125.
- National Assessment of Educational Progress (2019)). *How did U.S. students perform on the most recent assessments?* The Nation's Report Card. <https://www.nationsreportcard.gov/h>
- Park, Y. (2009). How motivational constructs interact to predict elementary students' reading performance: Examples from attitudes and self-concept in reading. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 21(4), 347–358.
- Northern Territory Government. (2016, September 27). *Tests of reading comprehension (TORCH)*. <https://education.nt.gov.au/will-test/diagnostic-assessment-selector/tests-of-reading-comprehension-torch>
- Parsons, A. W., Parsons, S. A., Malloy, J. A., Marinak, B. A., Reutzel, D. R., Applegate, M. D., Applegate, A. J., Fawson, P. C., & Gambrell, L. B. (2018). Upper elementary students' motivation to read fiction and nonfiction. *The Elementary School Journal*, (118)3, 505–523.
- Pennsylvania Department of Education. (2019). *School summary report*. SAS Institute, Inc.
- Perry, K. H. (2012). What is literacy?—A critical overview of sociocultural perspectives. *Journal of Language and Literacy Education*, 8(1), 50–71.
- Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (Eds.). (2008). *The Sage handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications. https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwjww6-KxcTqAhXPJzQIHRkRDqsQFjADegQIAxAB&url=https%3A%2F%2Ffikhsanaira.files.wordpress.com%2F2016%2F09%2Faction-research-participative-inquiry-and-practice-reasonbradburry.pdf&usg=AOvVaw1OAxF9-J2zZ5iA_mtQuZ3N
- Renaissance Learning. (2020). *About us*. Renaissance. Retrieved June 23, 2020 from <https://www.renaissance.com/about-us/>
- Renaissance Learning (2016). *STAR reading: Technical manual*. Author. Available from Renaissance Learning by request to research@renaissance.com
- Roe, B., & Burns, D. (2011). *Informal reading inventory: Preprimer to twelfth grade (what's new in education)* (8th ed.). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

- Shirtekar, R. (n.d.). *Whip around*. The Teacher Tool Kit. <http://www.theteachertoolkit.com/index.php/tool/whip-around>
- Short, K. G. (n.d.). *Graffiti boards*. The University of Arizona College of Education. https://www.coe.arizona.edu/sites/coe/files/graffiti_board.pdf
- Shriver, U. K., & National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. (2000). *Report of the national reading panel: Teaching children to read: Reports of the subgroups* (00–4754). U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Snow, C., & Moje, E. (2010). Why is everyone talking about adolescent literacy? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 91(6), 66–69. doi:10.1177/003172171009100616
- The Annie E. Casey Foundation. (2010). *Early warning! Why reading by the end of third grade matters*. Author.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1980). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. (M. Cole, V. John–Steiner, S. Scribner, & E. Souberman, Eds.). Harvard University Press.
- Vygotsky, L. S. (1986). *Thought and language*. (E. Hanfmann & G. Vakar, Eds.). MIT Press.
- West, L., & Cameron, A. (n.d.). *Turn and talk: One powerful practice, so many uses*. https://rbteach.com/sites/default/files/west_cameron_turn_and_talk_0.pdf
- What Works Clearinghouse. (2016, June). *Beginning reading intervention report: Accelerated reader*.TM Institute of Education Services, National Center for Education Evaluation and Regional Assistance. https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/Docs/InterventionReports/wwc_acceleratedreader_061416.pdf
- Wigfield, A. (1994). Expectancy-value theory of achievement motivation: A developmental perspective. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 6(1), 49–78.
- Wigfield, A., & Guthrie, J. T. (1997). Relations of children's motivation for reading to the amount and breadth of their reading. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89, 420–432.
- Willekes, Nicole. (2014). Disrupting the flow: The detrimental effects of accelerated reader on student motivation, *Language Arts Journal of Michigan*, 29(2), Article 7.